

A LECTURE  
ON THE  
HARMONY OF TEETOTALISM,  
WITH  
THE DIVINE WORD,

AS EXPRESSED IN THE AUTHORIZED VERSION OF THE BIBLE.

(With answers to several Objectors):

ABRIDGED FROM  
THE WORKS OF DR. LEES,

And printed for General Circulation.

---

“All the souveraine acts, dare I say,  
Of Victories in the old Testament,  
Thro veray God that is omnipotent,  
Were done in abstinence and in prayere;  
Look in the Bible, you may learn it there.”—*Chaucer.*

“The whole tenor of Scripture approves the principle of abstinence, and does honor to the men who practised it.”—*James Sherman, M.A.*

“Altho the Almighty has given no absolute and universal command to abstain from all intoxicating drinks, yet he has given His sanction to the principle, and has graciously expressed His satisfaction with those who acted upon it.”—*James Moore, B.A.*

---

LEEDS:  
DR. F. R. LEES, TRUTH-SEEKER OFFICE;

LONDON:  
W. TWEEDIE, 337½, STRAND.

---

PRICE FOURPENCE.

*Now publishing, by subscription and request,*

THE WORKS OF DR. LEES, of Leeds, revised by the author. They will contain an accurate portrait by Linton, and illustrative engravings.

The Entire Edition will be published, uniform in three volumes, post octavo, neatly bound, price to subscribers, 16s., to non-subscribers £1. Orders received up to May; one, or two volumes paid *in advance*.

The first two volumes (price 10s.) will be devoted to Physiology, Diet, and Temperance Criticism, including a chronological array of texts, translations, and comments, showing the Bible to be a Temperance Book.

The third volume is intended to contain a *System of Logic*, popularly treated, with some philosophical and exegetical essays. (Price 6s.)

---

*Preparing for successive Publication.*

ANCIENT TEETOTALISM; A History of the true Temperance Principle in the Ancient world.—4d.

THE TEMPERANCE, MODERATION, AND SOBRIETY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT *inclusive* of Teetotalism.—4d.

A SKETCH OF THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF DR. F. R. LEES, by a London Author; and a literary-portrait by January Searle.—6d.

THE FIRST PRIZE ESSAY ON THE PASSOVER-QUESTION, with a refutation of Dr. Halley's criticisms on the late Prof. Stuart.—6d.

☞ These will be sent, as published, to any address per post. An allowance for quantities *unstamped*; but only so many will be printed as are *previously ordered*. Address—enclosing stamps or post order—"Dr. Lees, Leeds."

---

A few copies are still on hand of

THE STANDARD TEMPERANCE LIBRARY, including the Teetotal Topic: an armory of facts for Temperance Reformers.—3s.

REPLY TO DR. LANKESTER, F.R.S., on the chemistry and physiology of Temperance.—3d.

PROFESSOR STUART'S last letter on *the Scriptural Wine-question*, with Notes by Dr. Lees, etc.—2s. 6d.

This is the work chiefly attacked by *W. Kelly*, the Plymouth Brother. A garbled passage, referring to the Antinomian doctrine of the *imputation* of the sinner's guilt to the sinless one (in terms similar to Barnes') is the sole foundation on which *W. Kelly*, with a pious malignity, *grossly falsifies* the Religious sentiments of the author, and for doing which Dr. Lees obtained the censure of a public meeting upon the libeller in the town in which *W. K.* resides. The public are warned that *W. K.* is not to be trusted in these matters.



22501952205

WELLCOME  
LIBRARY

pam

WM 274

1854  
L481\*



## TEETOTALISM IN ITS RELATIONS TO THE BIBLE HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

### PROPOSITION :

THAT TEETOTALISM, AS A DOCTRINE, A PRACTICE, AND A REMEDY,  
IS REPRESENTED IN THE BIBLE AS BEING DIVINELY-SANCTIONED.

**I**N ENTERING on this course of enquiry, let me guard against possible mistake or wilful misrepresentation. The teetotalers do not seek to base their doctrines *upon* the Bible: but are satisfied to affirm their *harmony* with it. They rest their cause, ultimately, not upon 'authority' of any kind, but upon 'evidence' universally accessible—the evidence of experience, of science, and of nature. If this fails them, no other thing can furnish them lasting support: if Experience and Science decide for them, it is of little moment what else may be *against* them. The Rock of 'Fact' must, in the long run, crush every fallacy and overturn every falsehood—remaining itself secure and immovable as the Eternal Power whose law it is. In affirming the proposition, therefore, let it be understood that I do it, not so much in my character of Teetotaler, as in my capacity of *Truth-Seeker*. I affirm it, because I believe that the Bible, historically and critically interpreted, represents the fact in the light of my proposition. As a Christian, indeed, I cannot be indifferent—and as a Critic I ought not to be averse—to the reconciliation of Philosophy and Faith, of Science and Scripture. I should be sorry, however, to allow my wishes to warp my evidence, since, in my sight, nothing can be more insulting to God than the supposition, often latent tho never avowed, that Truth needs the aid either of our deaf prejudices or our blind passions. Addressing myself to persons belonging to all sects, I shall not trench upon the ground of theological discussion; nor open up the vexed question of Inspiration, its nature and limits. We take the Bible *as it stands*.

Teetotalism  
founded on  
natural law

In this special argument I accept the Common Version as my general standard; and, apart from the niceties of criticism, I shall seek, by applying to the Book common-sense rules and accredited principles of interpretation, to ascertain *what it actually says and teaches* on the subject of my proposition. In proportion to our genuine reverence for the Bible—in my belief, rightly used, the best of books—will be our study to understand it,—to get *out* of it the genuine sense of the words it contains,—and our care to avoid every perversion of its proper meaning, especially that common one of introducing *into* it our own modern conceptions and educational prejudices.

Our object  
stated

One apostolic principle of prime importance and wide application, is commonly ignored—the command *rightly to divide the word* of truth, so as properly to *apply* its lessons to the circumstances and needs of men. Neglecting this, men endeavor to prove the most monstrous things from the Bible,—the Mormon, that God sanctions Patriarchal *Polygamy*,—the D.D.'s of the Carolinian Cotton Planter, that *Slavery* is a Divinely-approved 'Domestic Institution,'—and the Sensualist, that *poisonous-drink* is 'a good creature of God,' which may be soberly

The neglect to  
discriminate  
the various  
elements of  
the Bible



used—to drive away his care or to drown his sorrow! What then is the root of this fallacy? It consists in citing everything that is *in* the Bible as being expressive of the Divine Mind. On such a principle, the book is *not* divided rightly; is not separated into its several parts and elements, human and divine, historic and didactic;—on the contrary, the most distinct elements are confused and confounded together, and it is from this sad amalgamation of the holy and the unholy, of the historic records of man's folly and frailty with that which *alone* claims authority as the absolute Word of God,—that the advocates of Slavery and Sin are enabled to select their immoral maxims and draw their impure and iniquitous conclusions. It is as if the Egyptian were to confound the sweet-water of the Nile, with the mud which it sometimes holds in suspension! Nay, it is worse—for it is an endeavor to identify the water of life, the Divine truth pervading the human sphere, with that *virus* of sin which it is destined to neutralize and destroy. It is an attempt to convert a series of Books designed to instruct us in righteousness into Apologies for impurity and crime.

Let me illustrate my meaning by examples from the Old and New Testaments. In the book of Job you have the record of the words of God, of Satan, of Job himself, and of the patriarch's foolish wife and mistaken friends. Now, in arguing from this portion of scripture, can you properly cite a text at random? Are all texts of equal authority, and alike true? Are the words of evil and good spirits, of God and the Devil, of wise and foolish men, upon a par? Must you not discriminate here? and, in discriminating, what can you cite as representative of the *absolute truth*, save the Word of God alone? If the Bible itself is to be credited, we must distinguish not only between the *record and the religion*, but between the early and later Teachers whose wisdom it preserves to us. It is a record of progress in religious thought—it attests the process of a gradual elimination of old errors, and a gradual unfolding of more perfect truth—from Patriarchs inspired in but a small measure, to the Great Teacher in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily. He, indeed, had to confute this very fallacy. From his later and *perfect* moral teaching, the immoral Priesthood and Sects of his day appealed to the earlier and *imperfect* teaching of Moses—a teaching adapted to the infancy of society, but scarcely to its manhood. Of old, argued the Pharisee in defence of the laws of retaliation and of lust, it hath been said *thus* and *thus*: doest thou teach differently from our Father Moses? Even so! “I say unto you *otherwise*: be not ye overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good. Moses suffered this for the hardness of your hearts—but from the beginning it was not so.” Christ stood upon the Divine—the everlasting—that which, existing in the beginning of the Cosmic constitution, shall remain unto the end—the Alpha, and therefore the Omega.—A similar view is furnished in the account of the Temptation, where the Devil is represented as wantonly challenging the exercise of Divine power to convert stones into bread, and citing scripture after the fashion of his friends, the Pharisees. Mark the answers of the Redeemer! “Thou shalt not *tempt* the Lord, thy God ... Man shall not live by bread alone, but BY EVERY WORD THAT PROCEEDETH OUT OF THE MOUTH OF GOD.” This, then—the Divine Truth *in* the scripture,—is the only authoritative element that concerns our ques-

The divine  
Word alone  
authoritative

Matt. iv. 4



tion—and *this element is no where associated, by way of sanction or approval, with the dietetic use of intoxicating wine.* \*

The texts usually advanced against us, do not meet the requisitions of the case, either critically or logically. They are indeed wholly wide of the mark; and could never be cited at all by persons who had other than a confused conception of the proof we challenge, and which alone I can accept as adequate. No doubt, in many passages of scripture 'wine' is assumed to be a blessing; but, in most of those passages, the context shows that *un-intoxicating* wine is referred to,—not in a single instance that it is *intoxicating*. No doubt, also, intoxicating wine was sometimes drunk by 'good men' of old, and very often indeed by bad men. Is it not equally true, however, that such wine led *all* into sin? Moreover, did not those 'good-men'—not absolutely good, but good only according to the imperfect standard of their age—also practise polygamy and hold property in their fellow creatures? I ask you for DIVINE sanction, and you point me to the failings and imperfections of Man! No doubt, also, God who permitted slavery, polygamy, and lust, permitted intemperance also: *permitted* the use of intoxicating wine,—in itself, viewed apart from our knowledge of the true nature of alcohol, an act of a far less questionable kind than that of holding our brother men in bondage,—but where will you discover in the Bible a declaration to this effect—"Thus saith the Lord! *Slavery* hath my SANCTION; *Polygamy* my APPROVAL"? Both were 'permitted'—and even *laws* made to check and regulate, tho none totally, expressly, and universally to prohibit them. What you would affirm of these things, we assert of the use of *intoxicating* wine. Such practices formed no part of the goodness of the Patriarchs, and are not recorded as examples for us to follow. We must separate the chaff from the wheat, the good from the evil, the human from the Divine: 'rightly dividing' and applying 'the word of truth.'

The proof that is challenged

Confusion corrected

One other preliminary objection requires to be met. If the *use* of strong-drink was wrong, may we not suppose that God would have announced the truth to the Jews universally? I answer—the Bible negatives such a supposition. It shows that no explicit law announced the iniquity of slavery and the evil of lust. Even on these distinctly and directly moral topics, the revelation of truth was gradual—given as men were able to bear it, not as it exists in its own essential purity. Had the full blaze of Truth been poured upon the world at once, it could only have scorched and seared the consciences of men. Not being yet able to practise it, they would assuredly have profaned it. Nay, what glimmerings they had, they *did* profane. The Holy Spirit was rejected, because it was Holy: the Prophets stoned, because they preached of reformation. Our business, however, is not to make rash and presumptuous suppositions as to what God ought to reveal, but honestly to *interpret* the revelation which *is* made. In this argu-

Revelation gradual

\* The *apparent* exception is limited to one solitary passage, which is fully explained in the *Prize Essay on Deut.* xiv. 25, 26; and in the article '*Drink, Strong,*' in Dr. Kitto's *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*. It is only necessary here to state that there is no authority in the original for the epithet '*strong*' attached to '*drink*' in this passage. The Hebrew word consists of but three letters, s<sup>b</sup>k<sup>h</sup>R, and primitively denotes sweetness—drink that is *saccharine*. It is still applied in the East both to fresh palm-juice, and to the palm-juice fermented or drugged:

Deuteronomy  
xiv. 25, 26



ment we accept it as a common ground of enquiry, and proceed to compare *its* teachings with those of the Teetotaler.

Teetotalism  
defined

WHAT IS TEETOTALISM? Partly the negative branch of Temperance: for we regard dietetic Temperance as the proper use of good things, and abstinence from bad ones. But Teetotalism is more than a mere negation: it is an intellectual and a social Reform, having its doctrines, its duties, and its work. We abstain from intoxicating wine on the ground, as doctrine, that such wine is dietetically useless and evil—evil to the body, to the soul, and to the social life. We have no *ascetic* idea whatever connected with the movement—as several fine writers and closet philosophers have fancied:—on the contrary, we enjoy life amazingly,—like teetotalism because it contributes to our power of enjoyment,—and abstain from fermented-wine, not because it is ‘a good creature,’ but because it is a *bad-thing*. We proclaim a return to the natural and divine laws of diet and of organic life, as the truest and best preparation for all social improvement and religious progress. Finally, we affirm our conviction that so long as intoxicating beverages are consumed by any community, so long will intemperance, sensuality, and crime abound. As nervine stimulants they engender the fatal appetite of the drunkard,—and therefore no remedy short of abstinence can be either rational in theory or successful in practice.

Compared  
with the  
teaching of the  
Bible:

Now, I ask, where, in the Bible, do you find a single text, that, clearly and explicitly, represents God as *contradicting* these doctrines? It is remarkable—but no less a fact—that such a text does not exist. Our adversaries can only arrive at *their* doctrine by way of inference,—inference founded upon questionable principles of interpretation and doubtful canons of criticism. Our doctrines, on the other hand, harmonize at once with the *very words* of scripture, as well as with the entire spirit and object of revelation. The lessons of Holy Writ, as they stand before my view, may be arranged in a series of seven progressive propositions, comprehending, in their completeness, *all* the peculiar principles of the Temperance Society.

Intoxicating  
drinks are  
represented  
as evil

I. THE BIBLE REPRESENTS INTOXICATING-DRINK AS A BAD-THING, poisonous in its physiological, seductive in its moral, and corrupting in its social, relations. It does this under a threefold aspect. Indeed, three modes only being possible for such representations, the Inspiring Power adopts them all. It teaches 1, Symbolically; 2, Ethically; and 3, by Example.

1. *The Seers and Prophets of the Bible, in their character as such, teach that intoxicating wine is bad, by selecting it as the symbol of evil.*

Parable or  
μυθος  
explained

The allegorical method of teaching was suited to the early world, and everywhere adopted amongst the Priesthoods of Antiquity. “We may call the world itself a Parable or MYTH,” says Sallust, “wherein is the bodily appearance of visible-things, with an inward sense concealed beneath, as the Soul under the Body.”<sup>a</sup> In fact, symbolism founded on nature, is a kind of universal, because immutable, language. There is a pre-established harmony—a Divine correspondence—between it and the mind to which it appeals. It is not peculiar to Jew or Gentile, learned or illiterate, young or old. It is intended for *man*, as man; and hence I find it employed alike under the Patriarchal, the Mosaic, and the Christian dispensations. It is the clearest, because the simplest, method of instruction. Words expressing generalizations of the mind or principles of art may change, and ordinary language become confounded; but the speech which derives its *sense*



from the imperishable works of nature, or the facts of life, will never lose its significance. It will speak to us as it spoke to our first parents in Paradise, when God himself instructed them, and will continue uncorrupted to the end of time.\* When the Power of Evil is symbolized as a 'Serpent,'—are we not at once aware of the moral *nature* of the enemy, and of our own *danger*? As Jones of Nayland says, <sup>b</sup> "We understand that the Devil is *insidious* and *insinuating*; that his tongue is double, and his wounds *poisonous* and fatal." Why, I ask, should not we understand, in a like sense, the warning in Proverbs—"Look not thou upon the wine ... at the last it biteth like a *serpent* and stingeth like an *adder*"? If you would not tamper with the Devil, why with the Drink? The Passover law, in the prohibition of *all* fermented-things, furnishes another example of symbolic teaching. *Ferment* was rightly viewed by the ancients as *corrupted* matter; and hence excluded from the purest offerings, both amongst Jews and Gentiles. "The frame of mind in which we are to celebrate the Christian passover," says Jones, "is described to us in terms borrowed from the Jewish: this feast we are to keep with the *unleavened bread* of sincerity and truth; free from *all impure mixtures* of worldly affections,—pharisaical pride, hypocrisy, and false doctrine." Here, we perceive, an evil or *corrupted thing* is the type of moral corruption, and could not, therefore, *also* be the appropriate type of 'the bread of life.' Bread, simply as bread, in its generic sense, may be used as a symbol of pure truth—but *fermented*-bread, as such, can not. Thus water, simply as water,—or specifically 'clean' or 'pure water,'—appropriately symbolizes 'the water of life'—but tainted or bitter water can not. Is it not evident, then, from such examples, that the physical qualities of such things must determine their symbolic or figurative application?

It is not difficult to apply these principles to our question. Has not Moses made the matter plain enough in Deut. xxxii.? In the 14th verse blessings are clearly referred to, including a certain kind of wine—"Thou didst drink the *pure* || blood of the grape." But Israel forsook the Rock of his salvation, whence the living water streamed forth; "they sacrificed unto Devils; to Gods they knew not." Then it is added—"Their Rock is not as our Rock: for their Vine is of the vine of Sodom—their clusters are bitter—their Wine is the *poison* of dragons, and the cruel *venom* of asps" (32, 33). Surely, the 'pure wine' was as different from that on which the allusion to poison is founded, as the sweet grapes of Sorek from the bitter clusters of Sodom, or as the Deity they had forsaken from the Devils they adored! In his comment on Isaiah's beautiful parable of the Vineyard, Bishop Lowth observes as follows:—"By the force and intent of the allegory, to *good grapes* ought to be opposed fruit of a dangerous and *pernicious quality*; as, in the explication of it, to

Wine compared to the poison of adders

Deut. xxxii. 14, 15, 17

Ibid. 31-33

|| 'foaming.'

Isaiah v. Dr. Lowth's opinion

\* "The use of symbols extended to all times, and wisdom hath been communicated in this form by the teachers of every science and profession. We might wonder if it were not so; when God, from the beginning of the world, taught man after this form; setting life and death before him under the *symbols* of two trees; and it is both an ingenious and a sublime sentiment in a certain author, that the whole scenery of Paradise was disposed into an hieroglyphical school for the instruction of the first man; and that the same plan, so far as it could be, was afterwards transferred to the tabernacle and temple."—W. JONES, M.A. *Lectures on the Figurative Language of Scripture.* p. 320.



Judgment is opposed Tyranny, and to Righteousness, Oppression. GEPHEN, 'the vine,' is a common name, or genus, *including several species under it.*"<sup>d</sup> This is precisely the principle we apply to the word 'WINE,' which is a generic name, and therefore admits of its application to several species of wine. When allegorically employed to denote evil, we expect to find intimations of its being the *evil-species*. We conceive that good, innocent wine, can no more emblemize a moral evil or its punishment, than wild grapes can symbolize virtue, or good grapes vice. Wine of a hurtful kind, whether made so by fermentation or by the infusion of narcotic drugs, would, however, appropriately represent moral evil and judicial punishment. Now the Prophets *do* refer to such wine, when they desire to express a fearful religious corruption and the unfailing judgments of God upon the wicked. With them, as with the Orientals in general, 'water' and 'wine' were in contrast. As Porphyry notes of the Egyptian and Greek Mythos, "Dionysus holds two cups—the cup of generation, and also that of wisdom or initiation—*whose influence is contrary to that of the other.*"<sup>e</sup> The first was the cup of sense—the Lethe of the spirit, that rendered it oblivious of its duty and its destiny;—the second, *the Urn of Aquarius*, whose Water was quaffed by the returning spirit as by the returning sun, nourishing and purifying, while the Urn itself was the symbol of Deity, as of the Osiris-Canobus, who, with living water, irrigated the soil of Egypt,—and also an emblem of the hope that should cheer the dwellings of the dead.<sup>f</sup> Let it be recollected, as stated in the *Clavis Symbolica*, that the Egyptians appear to have been the earliest cultivators of symbolism, and that "in this the Jews were rather imitators than originals." This, probably, as suggested by Philo in his *Life of Moses*, and by Clement in his *Stromata*, was a part of that wisdom of Egypt in which the Jewish Lawgiver excelled. The importance of attending to the ancient mode of thought and expression, in the interpretation of the Hebrew books, must be obvious. Professor Kidd, in his learned work on the Antiquities of China, observes:—"Persons who had incurred the Royal displeasure, were condemned to drink *wine* out of a cup, called 'THE CUP OF PUNISHMENT.' The scripture reader will be reminded of such expressions as 'the wine-cup of His fury'—'the cup of trembling'—and others of the same import."<sup>g</sup>

The citation of a few of these passages will suffice to establish the fact that intoxicating wine was a well-known symbol of evil. Wine, mingled with intoxicating drugs, was given to criminals when about to be put to death. To this custom allusion is made in the Psalms. "God is the Judge ... In the hand of the Lord is a Cup, and the *wine* is foaming. It is full of mixture ... Verily, the dregs thereof all the *wicked* of the earth shall wring out, and drink them." In another Psalm this wine of wrath is represented as being to the drinkers 'the wine of *astonishment*'—which they were compelled to drink. The 'Cup of Fury' is said to be administered to Jerusalem, until she *reels* and staggers; but her sons have fainted at the heads of all the streets, and cannot help her. In Jeremiah the same symbolism is found. "Take the cup of *the wine of this wrath* at my hand, and give the nations to drink. They shall drink, and be *moved*, and be *mad*." Then the Prophet took the cup, and the nations became a desolation, an astonishment, and a curse. How could a 'blessing' be thus converted into the emblem of a terrible calamity? In the

Wine a symbol of evil, with the ancients:

Water of blessing

Psalms  
lxxv. 7, 8  
lx. 3

Isaiah li. 17  
Zech. ii. 2

Jer. xxv. 15



closing book of scripture intoxicating wine is still the selected symbol of evil. Benson, the excellent Wesleyan Commentator, has this observation on the Idolatrous Power to which the apocalyptic seer refers in the 14th of Revelations:—

“*The wine of her wrath*—or rather, ‘of the *inflaming* wine’ of her fornication. Hers was a kind of Circean Cup, with poisoned liquor to *intoxicate* and *inflame* mankind to spiritual fornication. St. John, in these figures, copies the ancient prophets.”

Rev. xiv  
8-10

The spirit that uniformly refers to ‘wine’-drinking, as symbolical of fatuity, vice, and madness, *must* have regard to a wine essentially bad.\*

2. *The Bible represents that intoxicating drink is evil, by direct, descriptive, or ethical teaching.*

Wine  
described as  
evil

It would be strange indeed if it did *not*,—even were we to regard it merely as a book preserving to us the highest moral lessons of antiquity, or to place it upon a par with the Vedas of the Brahmans, the Zend-avesta of the Persians, or the Golden Verses of Empedocles. On this lowest ground, I might ask, was Moses blind where the Magi perceived so clearly? Was Solomon less discriminating than Socrates? Was Daniel duller than Siddharta? or Paul than Pythagoras? But it is a *fact*, that Teetotalism everywhere pervaded the primæval Empires of the world, and was preached and practised by the greatest moral reformers and religious teachers of antiquity,—by many, indeed, centuries before a Jewish Nation existed. A learned writer in one of the quarterly reviews, while criticising some of our positions, thus confesses the antiquity of our doctrine:—“*Without contradiction, in every age of the world, there has been a total-abstinence movement ... The Religion and Laws of the nations of every portion of Asia bear traces of enlightened efforts to check the vice of Intemperance; and to this day, there are numerous tribes who, by religious profession, are total abstainers.*”<sup>h</sup> In my essay on ‘Ancient Teetotalism’ I have drawn out in detail the genealogy of our principle; and have shown that we need not blush for our pedigree. Beneath our ‘Family Tree,’ indeed, some of the greatest and purest and wisest of the sons of Men—the founders of states—the instructors in virtue—the fathers of philosophy—the lights of their age—have delighted to repose, to meditate, and to teach. We find Teetotalism under the shadow of the Pyramids and in the palaces of the Pharaohs;—we find it in the majestic Temples of the Nile, where Hermes held the mystic urn before the tribunal of Osiris-Amenthes, and on the plain of Argos, where Amydone, ‘the pure’ and ‘Irreproachable,’ observed the sacred Corn-feasts around the refreshing fountain that symbolled life from the dead;—we find it with Brahman and Buddhist, in the fruitful valleys which border the Himalas, as on the banks of the Ganges and in the groves of Ceylon;—we find it with Zoroaster in the plains of Persia, —with Pythagoras in the garden of Italy, with Epicurus in the classic

Ancient  
Teetotalism

\* “‘Having a golden cup in her hand’ (Rev. xvii. 4). That cup is the symbol of Idolatry and its rites. The mixed bitter cup of wine (Ps. lxxv, 8) is the symbol of torment or death ... *Evil* is represented by a Cup of Wrath: *Good* under the symbol of a Cup of Salvation.”—*Clavis Symbolica*. What can be more preposterous than the supposition that both cups contain the *same* kind of wine? Not so thought Homer (Iliad, xxiv):—

“*Two* urns by Jove’s high-throne have ever stood;  
“The source of Evil one—and one of Good.”



haunts of Greece, and with Tschu-Kung in the palace and parliament of China,—in short, we trace it everywhere in the van of the ancient civilizations,—proclaimed by that Holy Band of Saints and Sages who were the appointed ‘schoolmasters’ to the trans-Judean world, preserving at least a savor of virtue amongst men. Hermes and Amun, Menes and Manu, Zerdusht and Democrates, Lycurgus, Cyrus and Tschu-Kung, Mentche and Manahem, Siddharta and Seneca, Pythagoras and Epicurus, Parmenides and Empedocles,—these historic names are ‘witnesses’ of the extent to which the purifying principles of true temperance must have operated to check the corruptions of the ancient world.

A query

Here I have a question to put. Suppose your Bible to be a common Hindoo, in place of an *inspired* Hebrew, book; and you were to meet with this passage for the first time:—“*Wine* is a MOCKER, Strong drink is RAGING. *Look not* upon the wine when it is red. Who hath woe? They that go to *seek* mixed wine,” etc. Would you not at once infer that the writer must be a Teetotaler—and why? Because your previous knowledge of the fact that the Brahmans *are* teetotalers, will not *allow* you to seek for some method of explaining away the apparent meaning of the words. But, calling to mind the prevalence of teetotal doctrine amongst the highest men of the ancient world, would it not seem *likely* that somewhat similar opinions might exist among the seers and sages of the Jews? The Hebrew people were but too much under the influence of the *evil* around them; can we then imagine that the *better* teaching with which they came in contact, thro commerce or captivity, would have *no* influence? That *all* the wisdom of that Egypt from which they came, and of India, Persia, and Greece, would be rejected, and leave no trace behind? History has made the contrary certain. We *know* that it was only in the captivity that they became acquainted with the Magian dogma of a resurrection, for they had previously conceived of the state of the dead very much as Homer did. It was thro the same channel, probably, that some of their best men saw the propriety of the Magian and Pythagorean doctrine of abstinence,—enforced as it was by the sad calamities which intemperance and idolatry had brought upon their nation. Numbers go back from the captivity with altered views, and a temperance reform commences, which, in another age, leaves Judea one of the soberest of countries. Of the celebrated community of the Essenes—the Jewish historian, Josephus, thus speaks:—“These men live the same kind of life as do those whom the Greeks call *Pythagoreans*...It is but fit to set down here the reasons wherefore Herod had these Essenes in such honor...There was one, named Manahem, who had this testimony, that he not only conducted his life after an excellent manner, but was endued by God with the foreknowledge of future events...Many of the Essenes have, by the excellency of their life, been deemed worthy of divine Revelations.”<sup>1</sup>

The teetotal  
Essenes

---

\* When I said that I accept the Common Version, I meant that my main arguments would rest in perfect safety upon its *very words*, tho I have not thought it needful always to adhere to them. Whenever I have thought that the versions of the learned, as of the Seventy, of Bishop Lowth, Professor Noyes, or of Dr. Benisch, the Jew, better represented *the sense* of the Original, I have not *dared*, out of superstitious feeling towards the Church Version, to adhere to the less accurate translation of any passage.



The application of these facts to the question before us is plain. To borrow the words of a great Catholic Divine, "I lay it down as my rule of Interpretation, that the *true meaning* of words or texts, is that which the speaker must have known would be affixed to his words by those whom he addressed, and that we are to *put ourselves in their situation.*" In short, *we must invest ourselves with their circumstances,—take their stand-point,—and make our enquiry in their position.*<sup>j</sup> The second law of interpretation, is thus laid down in a standard work on Hermeneutics. "Always explain with a view to the spirit and mode of thinking of the age for which a writing was immediately intended."<sup>k</sup> Now, ordinary expounders of the Bible reverse these rules—they invest ancient writings with modern circumstances, look at oriental books with occidental eyes, and make the notion of the present the interpreter of the language of the past. Instead of mentally placing the reader in the position of the writer, they put the ancient author in the position of his modern reader! By such methods they make the Bible 'a nose of wax,' which they twist and mould to any and to every purpose. What folly, for example, will they make of Solomon's proverbial philosophy. "*Wine is a mocker—Strong-drink is raging.*" The doctrine of the words, plainly understood, is both historically and physiologically accurate: was as true of wine then as it is true of opium now. All nervine stimulants and narcotics, whatever their name or their form, mock and seduce, or inflame and deceive. So thought and so taught the ancients. "*Wine,*" says Plutarch, "*is in itself of a violent and exciting nature: it augments, and makes more unquiet, the already too stormy perturbations of the body.*"<sup>l</sup> In another book he refers to a wine often cleared and filtered—that "*neither inflames the head nor infests the mind and passions*"—not a wine that rages, but one that is "*mild and wholesome.*" Possibly this wine may have contained an infinitesimal amount of alcohol, but it was practically weak, and therefore called by Theophrastus '*moral*' (ἠθικόν).<sup>\*</sup> Columella and Pliny both notice a black-vine which the Greeks call Amethystos, or

Historic principles of interpretation laid down.

Plutarch of wine.

'Moral wine.'

\* An opponent at Guernsey, cannot understand the *sense* of Theophrastus, which he transmutes into the 'absurd.' Were he to edit Shakspeare, he might mistake the Poet as much as he mangles the Apostle. "Here's *that which is too weak to be a sinner—HONEST WATER,*"—would puzzle *him*, doubtless; and yet the English nation can see and feel its truth. Referring to the 'innocent Lesbian' of Horace, the critic says:—"That it was amongst the *weakest* wines, and therefore termed comparatively '*innocent*'—ALL ADMIT." That in the ratio of its approximation to water—wine is '*innocent*'—'*moral*'—'*honest*'—does not seem a very '*absurd*' mode of speech to *us*: any more than the contrary attribution to *strong-wine* in our text—that it is a ' *mocker*' or '*raging.*' As certainly, therefore, as Shakspeare meant to signify the quality of water, and to distinguish it from '*hot and rebellious liquors*'—and Horace and Theophrastus by the terms '*innocent*' and '*moral,*' the '*comparative absence*' of the intoxicating principle—so certainly did Solomon intend, by the reference to mocking and raging, to designate the '*positive presence*' of the Evil '*Spirit of wine.*' We may say of *intoxicating* wine what Plutarch says of the toxic *ivy* eaten by the ancient Bacchanals: "They speak not altogether absurdly, who say, that it hath in it *a certain spirit that stirreth and moveth to madness; turneth men's minds to fury; driveth them to extasies; troubleth and tormenteth them; in one word, maketh them drunk.*"—(*Rom. quest.* 112.) As of the *ivy*, so of the drugged and fermented wine, such language *must* be understood of some-thing with a fixed quality.

Admission of an opponent.

unintoxicating. Columella affirms that it is called *Inerticula* in Latin (from *iners*, 'inert') because it produces a good wine, *innoxia*, 'free from harm'—and not trying to the nerves. Pliny says that this *Inerticula* would more justly be called *sober* (sobriam), being commendable for a wine that is free from *noxia* to the strength. Parallel prohibitions can be adduced from the Poems of Homer, the Laws of Plato, and the Proverbs of Scripture; but of what avail to the man who *will* interpret language from no stand-point save his own?—who, in fact, to suit a prejudice or an appetite, would *understand the same words differently*, in the bible of the Jews and the books of the Gentiles!

The 'Sober wine' of Columella (iii. 2) and Pliny (xiv. 2).

But how *does* this class expound Solomon's words? Widely different indeed is their version from that of the venerable Rabbins who, some two centuries before Christ, translated the Hebrew-text into Greek. These render—"Wine is *an intemperate-thing*—strong-drink is *full of violence*;"—but our school of modern doctors (reckless of the warning—"Add not thou to his word, lest thou be found a liar") say we are deceived by a 'figure of speech.' The text, they allege, signifies "*Excess of wine is a mocker—excess of strong-drink is raging*"! One is ready to ask, If the *first* glass has no mocking-quality, how can the second or the third have any? Does a glass somewhere, be it the fifth or the fifteenth, gain all at once, and by the magic of number, a new property?

B. C. 280.

Absurd interpretations exposed.

To escape such questions, our learned pundits will vary their version and read:—"Intemperance is a mocker: *intemperance* is raging: and whosoever is deceived by *intemperance* is not wise." If the version was foolish before, it is fatuous now. What need of ethical philosophy—to say nothing of inspiration—to warn people against being deceived by 'excess' or 'intemperance'? *That* never deceived any one, and never will. It has sometimes the effect of opening our eyes to the nature of *that which leads to it*—but it never deceives us *into* itself. When the youthful Cyrus, at the Median Court of his grandfather, beheld the intemperance of the King and his Lords, did it deceive him? What was his answer to the invitation to drink out of the royal cup? Pointing to the *disturbing* effect of wine on the mental and bodily functions of the courtiers, which, as he knew, an innocent beverage could never induce, he said—"I drink no wine; *it is poison*." And none of you, I suppose, are ignorant of that famous historic example of the Lacedæmonians, who made their slaves drunk, expressly to teach their children temperance. Christian Britons, however, have no need of slaves for such a purpose—many masters, and some mistresses, of all ranks and classes, are but too willing to perform the office of the Spartan helots!

Wine a mocker; intemperance not.

Solomon *characterizes* intoxicating drinks in general, as 'full of violence,' and *warns* us against being 'deceived' by them. Such language, if found in the certificate of a servant who applied for admission to your household, would scarcely be accepted as testimony to 'a good character.' Yet how many persons introduce this 'mocker' into the most sacred recesses of 'the living temple,' where it never fails, in some degree, to poison the blood and pollute the brain!

The wise man does more: he describes *two distinct classes of intoxicating wine*—the drugged and the fermented. "Who hath woe? who hath sorrow?" is the question put. The answer is—

Two species of intoxicating wine: fermented and drugged.

Prov. 23. 30.

"They that tarry long at *the wine*—  
"They that go to seek *mixed wine*."



It so happens, that in this country, where brandied wines are sufficiently potent for almost any appetite, people are not accustomed to drink drugged or *mixed*-wine. Even the old practice of mixing water with it has died out. Thus, no appetite preventing, commentators of every sect have agreed as to the nature of this '*mixed*-wine.' It was wine made strong, they say, by the admixture of stimulating spices and narcotics, such as opium, myrrh, mandragora, etc. No critic, has yet taken pen in hand as *its* apologist. But why not? I like *thoro'ness* in all things; and if a single-glass of alcoholic-wine (classed with this drugged wine as the parent of common-consequences) is really good,—why should 'a little drop' of *poppied* wine be bad? Alcohol and opium are poisons of the same class—narcotics. It cannot be that the evil is in the *solidity* of the one—the good in the *liquidity* of the other! A distinction of that sort would furnish no sober reason for a difference of moral treatment. If opium-wine be bad, it is because of its narcotic *nature* and *intoxicating* properties. But these are common to wine and opium—and therefore the use of these and all similar agents must stand or fall together. One thing, however, I must add, as important in an argument relative to the Bible:—the effects of alcohol on the *moral-nature* of man are worse, very much worse, than those of opium. Inspiration—or even common-sense—could never bless *alcoholically*-intoxicating-wine with one breath, and curse all *poppically*-intoxicating-wine with the other. Nor does it. Wisdom is justified of her children, and she places both wines in the same category of condemnation, and pronounces them to be the excitors of lust and the generators of perversity.

Both species  
bad or neither.

As it appears to me, fermented-wine is also described by some outward characteristics; not those it exhibits *only while fermenting* in the vat—but those which result *from* that process. Baron Liebig, one of the greatest of chemical authorities, shall state the phænomena of the fermenting process, and you can then judge for yourselves how far its products may be identified with the wine that Solomon describes.

Fermented  
wine described

"The fermentation of grape-juice begins with a chemical action. An appreciable volume of oxygen is absorbed from the air; the juice THEN becomes *colored* and turbid, and the fermentation commences *only* with the appearance of this precipitate." <sup>m</sup>

Liebig.

A few words will explain these effects. The coloring-matter of all grapes, save one or two species, resides in the *skin*, and may be extracted by a chemical solvent. Alcohol is such; and hence the 'coloring' of the wine is a sign of its presence. Ferment is produced by the action of air on the albumen of the juice, which is thereby transformed into yeast. Yeast, as matter in a state of motion or decay, communicates its action to the sugar, which, becoming decomposed in turn, is transmuted into the fluid alcohol and the gas carbonic. The gas, gradually generated, bears up the yeast for awhile, as *spume* or head; but as the gas escapes, the yeast sinks to the bottom. Thus arise the phænomena noted by Liebig—the alcohol *reddens* the juice by extracting the coloring matter from the skins, and the rising and falling of the yeast, thro' the gradual liberation of the gas, produces the *turbid* appearance. In many wines, this process is not *finished* in the Vat—what is called a 'secondary fermentation' takes place in the bottle or the vessel that receives the wine. Now (unlike the *Virgin-wine* of Hungary, Spain, and Sicily, which is of a pale straw color, and gives forth no 'eye' or bubble,) this fermented-wine is *red*,

How wine  
becomes red  
and sparkling.



and on pouring it out, globules of *fixed-air* rise up and sparkle in the cup, giving that appearance of *self-movement* which is characteristic of champagne, and other effervescing fluids. Of such wine, what says the Bible?

Proverbs  
xxiii. 30-3.

|| or 'eye.'

"LOOK NOT thou upon the wine WHEN it is red—  
"When it giveth its *bubble*|| in the cup—  
"When it moveth itself straightly \*—  
"At the last it biteth like a serpent,  
"And stingeth like an adder.  
"Thine eyes will look upon strange women,  
"And thy heart will utter perverse things."

|| Not one of  
Solomon's  
proverbs.

The Church *Homily* on 'Intemperance' (A.D. 1623) gives a brief and sensible comment:—"Solomon || forbiddeth the very sight of wine. Certainly *that* must needs be very hurtful which biteth and infecteth like a *poisonous* serpent, whereby men are brought to filthy fornication, which causeth the heart to devise mischief." <sup>n</sup>

History  
teaches that  
wine is seduc-  
tive.

3. *The Bible, as a book of History, which is 'Philosophy teaching by Example,' represents the use of strong-drink as being seductive in its nature and corrupting in its consequences.*

It does this, in the first place, by its Biographic Notices; and, in the second, by the National Annals which it contains. From the one class of instances we may derive special instruction for our personal guidance,—from the other, lessons of great social and national moment.

Case of Noah.  
Gen. ix. 23.

And how impressive is the earliest scriptural instance of drunkenness! Noah—the second father of our race—the righteous man—the favored prophet—the patriarchal priest—the monument of divine mercy—placed too in the most solemn and peculiar circumstances—the first recorded victim to the seductive influence of *wine*! Not long since, there appeared in the Paris 'Illustrated News,' an engraving of the vintage. What, think you, was the history it represented? In the background was a view of Ararat, with the ark reposing on its summit—in the foreground an Oriental Patriarch, seen thro' the opened curtains of his tent, prostrate and disarrayed, '*overcome of wine.*' Yet from such premisses men infer that wine is good! It is safe to the profane people, *because* it has been seductive to the pious patriarchs! "No doubt," says the good Dr. Haweis, in his *Evangelical Expositor*,—"when Noah began to drink wine, he never *intended* to be drunk with it." Wine proved 'a mocker' and a curse to Noah—can it be a friend and blessing to us? The ancients—and probably Noah himself; for we have no account of his subsequently using wine—drew a very different inference from the fact of the Patriarch's failure. Savary, the learned French writer, has this observation:—"Whence the oriental aversion to wine originated would be difficult to say, but exist it did; which probably suggested the prohibition of wine by Mahomed. We should *perhaps look for the reason of this aversion to the case of Noah.*" <sup>o</sup>

Fall of Lo  
Gen. xix.

The second example of intemperance is like unto the first. The hitherto pure and 'just Lot'—pure and just amidst abounding

\* A writer before referred to, thinks this line should be translated "*When it goeth-down sweetly.*" Well, let it be supposed to refer to the pleasure of the drinker's taste; how does that alter our argument? He will have hard work to convert the *redness* and *effervescence* of WINE *in a cup*, into a description of a MAN *in his cups*!



iniquity—escapes from the cities of the plain and their fiery plagues, only to be stung by that wine which is a mocker, and the poison whereof is more mortal than ‘the cruel venom of asps.’ As Moses’ words elsewhere suggest, ‘the wine of Sodom’ was given him to drink; and he reaps the fearful penalty of guilt and pollution. Henceforth the name of the patriarch is blotted out from the page of history! Well remarks Dr. Haweis on this sad passage: “No man this side heaven is safe from *presumptuous* sins, or above praying to be kept from them.” And what, I ask, can be more presumptuous than first to introduce into our system a narcotic agent that physically *tends* ‘to steal away our brain’—and then to ask God to ‘deliver us from temptation’?

A.D. 1756.

A third instance of intemperance is found amongst the Priests. If the command of abstinence had a real adaptation to the sin of Nadab and Abihu,—and we *must* assume that it had,—then we perceive another proof of the deceptiveness of wine, in the fact that it seduced the Priests into intemperance, even amidst sacred things and in the season of their deliverance in the wilderness. Tho the sons of Aaron, the High Priest, they perished fearfully for their sacrilege!

The Priests.  
Lev. x.

The Church rightly teaches that these and similar instances,—in which Priest, and Prophet, and Patriarch, and Prince, are numbered amongst the victims of wine,—are given to *warn* us of danger.\* If the highest station, the Divinest gifts, the most virtuous character, the longest experience, and even the signs of the Divine Presence in Tabernacle and Temple,—are no absolute *safeguard* where ‘the mocker’ is drunk,—how palpable the inference—“Where *they* fell, how much more are we in danger!” Their history is as a beacon, or lighthouse;—not inviting the approach of vessels sailing on the Ocean of Life, but warning them of the dangerous and hidden rock on which so many ‘goodly ships’ have gone to wreck, and telling them to *keep far out at sea!*

The Church’s  
inference.

The Bible history also supplies the most striking examples of the corrupting influence of strong-drink on the Jewish Church and Nation.

The Hebrews had been sojourners in Egypt;—but in the land where once they had enjoyed privileges, they now experienced oppression. The dynasty under which Joseph and his people had risen to favor had passed away, and jealousy of their numbers and power now impelled the Egyptians to the adoption of a cruel policy towards the children of Israel. Still there is no ground for supposing that they were excluded, as slaves, from the use of the ordinary diet of the country. They seem to have enjoyed sufficiently the delicate fruits and produc-

Influence of  
intemperance  
on the Jewish  
church and  
nation.

\* “Now of those which take occasion of carnality and evil life, by hearing and reading in God’s book, what God had *suffered*, even in those men praised in the scriptures—as Noah, so *drunk* with wine that in his sleep he [lay] uncovered,—The just man, Lot, in like manner drunken—Abraham, besides with Sara his wife had also carnal company with Agar,—the Patriarch Jacob, had to his wives two sisters at one time,—the Prophet David, and King Solomon his son, had many wives and concubines,—which things we see are now repugnant to all public honesty. These and such like in God’s book, *good people*, are not written that *we* should do *the like*. ... We ought to learn by them *this* profitable lesson, that if so godly men as *they* were, which otherwise felt inwardly God’s holy spirit, did so grievously fall, how much more ought *we* then, *miserable wretches, which have no feeling of God within us at all*, continually to fear that we also be overcome and drowned in sin.”—*Homilies*, etc. Part I. 1623.



The Jews  
educated in  
sobriety.

Numb. 20. 5.

tions of the land—tho debarred from liberty, the ‘bread of nations.’ We must recollect, however, that, in those ages, Teetotalism was a current doctrine of the Egyptian Priesthood, and prevalent therefore amongst the highest of the population. Moreover, tho vines were cultivated in the hill country, and, as evinced by paintings of the vintage taken from the tombs of Beni Hassan, wines both fermented and *boiled* prepared,—*wine* was nevertheless scarce and dear, and not likely to have been given to those in a servile condition. But the hour of deliverance arrived, and the Israelites, under the leadership of Moses, commence their exodus. In the trials of the wilderness, they look back with a slavish longing to their old ‘comforts,’ yet betray no attachment to wine as to an accustomed luxury. The language of their murmuring to Moses intimates their content with water as a beverage. “Wherefore have ye made us to come up out of Egypt unto this evil place? It is no place of seed, or of figs, or of *vines*, or of pomegranates, neither is there any *water* to drink.” The fugitives are supplied with ‘water from the rock’—by Him who best knew their nature and their needs as pilgrims of the desert. That generation, however, perished in the wilderness, and their children, it is certain, were trained and educated as water-drinkers. Whatever else might be their faults and failings, they were, on their entrance into ‘the promised land,’ at least a *sober people*.\*

As conquerors of Canaan, they entered upon a land rich in corn and vines and fruit of varied sorts, sufficient to satisfy the demands of nature, and to gratify the most fastidious appetite. Mark now their subsequent history!

Are they not represented as having had a series of valiant leaders and wise judges, of inspired seers and patriotic champions? Had they not an established hierarchy to discharge the services of the tabernacle and the temple,—a lay order of Levites to train and instruct the people in the law,—and a ‘school of the prophets’ wherein the sacred truth might be interpreted and preserved? Is not their history, for more than eight hundred years, one of miraculous interference, of singular providences, and of extraordinary teaching? Were ever community and church *so* favored? Was ever result more deplorable and disappointing? When the trial is nearly over, and the decree of banishment about to go forth, how, on the part of Jehovah, does the prophet state the case?—

“Judge ye, between me and my vineyard!

“*What inure* could have been done for my vineyard

“That I have not done for it?”

\* It may here be *plausibly* objected, from the case of Nadab and Abihu, as narrated in Leviticus, that as those Priests drank wine even to excess, the People would only be too apt, as in other countries and ages, to follow the example. We have elsewhere explained this passage in full; it need only be observed in this place, that *no grape-vines* grew in the wilderness, hence no wine-of-the-vine could be drunk. The wine appointed to be offered upon the altar was שֵׁכָר, ‘sweet-drink’—*palm-wine*. But the palm tree groves were ‘few and far between’ in the desert, and could not possibly furnish beverage for a vast multitude of wanderers. The *people* had no means of procuring wine, even if they had desired it, which they did not. The sons of Aaron had perhaps drank of the palm wine in its *fermented* state—induced either thro pure neglect to preserve the palm-juice by well known methods, or of set purpose for the gratification of their sensual appetite.

Isa. v. 2-4.

Lev. 10.



“*Why, then, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes,  
Brought it forth wild-grapes?*”

Do the prophets throw no light on the agencies that *hindered* the good, and converted blessings into curses? Nay, of those

“That put darkness for light, and light for darkness—  
“That put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter!”—

Isa. v. 20.

is it not immediately intimated that intemperance was one of their beloved vices?

“Woe to them that are valiant to drink wine,  
“And men of might to mix strong-drink!  
“For they have cast away the Law of Jehovah of hosts,  
“And despised the word of the Holy One of Israel!”

Isa. v. 22-24.

Let us glance, however, at the history of the Jews, and see whether, in the enumeration of special corrupting influences, the *love of liquor*, with the luxury and lust which ever accompany it, is not distinctly referred to?

Not till long after the settlement of the Hebrews in Palestine, do we find notices of the use of wine as a common beverage, or as a prized and prominent article of diet. Still, however, drunkenness does increase;—the lust of liquor ‘grows with what it feeds upon.’ In the four centuries intervening between the conquest of Canaan and the reign of David, we have abundant proof of the fact that intemperance was fatally increasing. In the arts of civilization, the Jews had of course progressed. The rude camp had given place to the royal court, and the pastoral simplicity of the tent, to the splendor of the palace and the temple. But the traditional soberness of Egypt and the desert wanderers—the warning furnished in the fate of Aaron’s sons, and the consequent prohibition of wine to the *ministering* Priests, the lessons of temperance Divinely taught to the pledged and pious Nazarite, and the practical protest of the sons of Rechab, became, alas! gradually forgotten, or wilfully disregarded.

The lust of liquor a growing evil.

Solomon had felt compelled to note the fact—a fact, in all likelihood, verified in his own experience—that “*wine is a mocker, strong-drink raging.*” The ‘Words of the Wise’ (afterwards collected by ‘the men of Hezekiah,’ and incorporated in the roll of the ‘Proverbs’) very clearly refer to the use of drugged and fermented wines, and indicate their sad effects in poisoning the body, polluting the soul, and enslaving the moral nature. Wine is described as biting like a basilisk—as exciting lust in the heart—as prostrating the body—and as depriving the man, not only of sensation, but of *sense* and *will*; for, when he awakes to his condition, his cry still is, “*I must seek it yet again!*”

B. C. 1040.

See Eccl. ii. 3.

Proverbs  
23: 32-5.

Intemperance could be no rare phenomenon when even Kings and Princes stood *in need* of cautions and prohibitions on the subject—as indicated by the maternal advice given to the royal Lemuel:—

“It is not for kings to drink wine,  
“Nor for princes to desire strong-drink;  
“Lest they drink and forget the law,  
“And pervert the rights of any of the afflicted:

advice that will remind you of the answer of Hector to the invitation to drink wine, and which must be regarded as marking a prevalent belief of the early ages:—

“My royal mother, bring no wine, *lest rather it impair  
“Than help my strength, and make my mind forgetful of the affair  
“Committed to it.”*

Homer.  
Il. vi.  
B.C. 850.



In the two centuries following the reign of Solomon, 'the magnificent,' luxury and intemperance rapidly increased, and along with it the kindred vices of idolatry and lust, pride and oppression. Hear the testimony of Hosea.

B. C. 740.

Hosea iii.

"The Sons of Israel look to other gods and love raisin-cakes.

iv. 6, 11.

"My people is destroyed for lack of knowlege.

vii. 5, 6.

"Idolatry, and *wine*, and grapes, take away their hearts.

"In the day of our king, the princes are sick with the heat of wine:

"And *he* stretches out his hand with the scorers."

This shows a close connexion between intemperance and profanity.

The evidence of Amos is equally decisive as to the prevalence of the drinking-system among persons of rank, and the evils associated with it.

Amos. iv. 1.

"Hear this word...ye that oppress the poor,

"Who crush the needy, who say to their masters,

"Bring, and let us drink."

And not only were the people addicted to do wrong themselves, but they were offended at others doing right. Hence they disliked the self-denial of the Nazarites *in the article of wine*, for it was to them *a living rebuke*, and they wickedly tempted them to break their Divinely-appointed *pledge*.

Amos ii. 6, 8,  
11, 13.

"Thus saith Jehovah: For three transgressions of Israel,

"And for four, will I not turn away their punishment ...

"They lay themselves down upon pledged garments,

"Near every altar;

"And drink *wine*, extorted by fines,

"In the house of their gods ...

"Of your sons I raised up prophets,

"And of your young men Nazarites ...

"*But ye gave the Nazarites wine to drink,*

"And commanded the prophets, saying, Prophecy not!

Amos vi.

"Woe to them that put far away the day of evil,

"And bring near the seat of oppression—

"*That drink wine in bowls,*

"And anoint themselves with precious perfumes,

"But grieve not for the affliction of Joseph:

"*Therefore shall they go into captivity.*"

A few years later, Micah points to the same condition of general corruption,—in which prophet and priest, prince and people, are alike enslaved to sensual pleasures and stupid idolatry.

Micah ii. 11.

"If a man walking in the *spirit of falsehood* do *lie*,

"Saying, I will prophesy unto thee of wine and of strong-drink,

"He shall be the prophet of this people!"

In another place he reveals the base motives of these false teachers:—

"*Thus saith the Lord*, concerning the prophets *that cause my people to err*,

"And who, *if one fills not their mouths*, prepare war against him:—

Micah iii. 5-11.

"The sun shall go down upon the prophets, and the day be dark to them.—

See also

"*Her priests teach for hire—her prophets divine for money;*

Hosea ix. 7.

"And yet they lean upon Jehovah, saying,

"Is not Jehovah in the midst of us?"

B.C. 725.

When, after the evil reign of Ahaz, Hezekiah ascended the throne, and sought to sanctify the temple and stem the flowing tide of sensuality, he had to call in the Levites to his aid, since the bulk of the priests had disqualified themselves for the duty. "Wherefore their



brethren the Levites, did help them till the work was ended"—*they* being "more upright in heart to sanctify themselves than *the priests*."\*

On another occasion the purpose of the King and all the congregation in Jerusalem, to observe the Passover in the second month, was defeated thro' the *unfitness* of the Priests—and when it *was* observed, after some delay, the Levites had the work partly to perform. If one of the principal causes of this frightful declension from every thing like virtue and piety, has not been made evident enough, the prophet Isaiah must remove all doubt. The language he puts into the mouth of the Priesthood, shows how these mercenary guides sought to influence the people:—

"Come ye," say they, "Let us fetch wine;  
"And let us FILL OURSELVES with *strong-drink*,  
"And to-morrow shall be as to-day,  
"And even much more abundant." †

Isaiah lvi. 12.

The advice was fatally adopted, as Isaiah himself records:—

"Woe to them that *rise early in the morning* to follow strong-drink;  
"Who tarry until night that wine may *inflame* them!  
"And the lyre and the harp, ... and *wine* are at their feasts;  
"But they regard not the work of Jehovah,  
"And the doings of his hand they do not perceive.  
"Therefore shall my people be led into captivity."

Isaiah v.

Further on, the prophet illustrates the wisdom of the teetotal advice given to King Lemuel, and the consequences of its neglect:—

"Woe unto them that are valiant to drink wine,  
"And men of might to *mix* strong-drink!  
"That clear the guilty for a reward!  
"And take away from the righteous his right."

From the tribe of Ephraim Isaiah had hoped for better things—in vain! He thus takes up his touching lament:—

"Even these stagger thro' wine,  
"And reel thro' strong-drink.  
"The Priest and the Prophet stagger thro' strong-drink:  
"They are *swallowed-up* of wine;  
"They reel thro' strong-drink—  
"THEY STUMBLE IN PROPHECY; THEY STAGGER IN JUDGMENT."

Isa. xxviii. 7.

What save a reeling-vision, or an intoxicated brain, *can* misread such a history as this! The social and moral advancement of the Jewish nation hindered,—the aims and efforts of its prophets and reformers frustrated,—and the coming of 'the better dispensation' *delayed* by man's unfaithfulness to the privileges of that preparatory œconomy. A privileged church, and a peculiar and favored people, corrupted by the use of strong-drink; until, at last, in order to effect a reform, their temple is destroyed, their priesthood dispersed, and their people driven

Strong-drink  
condemned by  
its fruits.

\* Hezekiah seems to have been a *wise* reformer. We should not forget one noted act of his, greatly promotive of sobriety—his construction of a reservoir and conduit for supplying Jerusalem with water, by stopping the upper water-course of the brook Gihon, and bringing the stream direct to the west side of the city. (Comp. 2 Chron. xxxii. 30; 2 Kings xx. 20.)

† It would seem that the most precious liquor was for the Priest—the *palm-wine* for the People! Thus the priests sought to divert attention from their own enjoyment of one liquor, by encouraging the general use of another!



into prolonged captivity. The purpose and issue of that divine judgment—I shall have to consider by and by:—here it is enough to ask, Whether a tree that has ever borne such bitter fruit, a fountain that has given forth perpetually such poisoned waters,—a custom that has been uniformly followed by such awful consequences, *is not by the very fact proved to be BAD?* In the Bible, there is no second side to this history. Nowhere is *good* exhibited as the effect of intoxicating beverages—but “*evil only, and that continually.*” Hence, as philosophy teaching by uniform example,—example on the broadest scale,—the Bible History proclaims the use of strong-drink to be an evil and corrupting practice—opposed, in its tendency and its issues, equally to the progress of true social reform, and to the purity and power of real religion. As a tree that brings forth evil fruit, ought we not to lay the axe to the root, and hew it down?

II.—ACCORDING TO THE BIBLE, TEETOTALISM IS THE GENUINE OBSERVANCE OF THE REVEALED LAW OF FOOD.

Teetotalism  
the revealed  
law of food.

It re-proclaims the ancient truth that God's works are not only ‘good,’ but, in their mutual adaptations, ‘very good.’ It practically asserts that the natural law of food is *essentially best*; that He who so wisely formed the first man and the fairest woman, failed not to establish and ordain a law of life equally wise. Nor is it inconsistent with my principles to appeal to such a law, notwithstanding that it is quite true the Bible was never designed to inculcate a dietetic system upon the race. Supernatural revelation is not required where natural faculties will suffice; and they certainly *are* sufficient for ascertaining what we should eat and drink. I speak this of *mankind*, but it was different with the *first pair*—and a first pair, as even Geology shows, there must have been. They had no *experience*—no earthly teachers—and hence the expectation is rational, that He who, by some strange tho not unprecedented interference with the *routine* of his universe, called the ‘Paragon of Animals’ into being, would also impart to them—by audible instruction or intuitive cognition—such *information* of the nature, qualities, and uses of the objects around them, as might serve to preserve them in being, until their dormant powers had become developed and their ordinary senses *educated*.\* Hence the oriental



\* Those conversant with physiological and mental science, will at once apprehend the fact I refer to. Bishop Berkeley long ago proved, and Cheselden demonstrated when a blind man was first couched for cataract, that we do not *see* distance, but *infer* it,—correctly or otherwise, according to our experience. The uneducated faculty of the child allows it to conclude that the moon is but just above us, and may be plucked down like a toy;—a sailor will mistake the distance of a mountain peak, and a landsmen err enormously in his visual measurements at sea. Hence the singular truthfulness of the statement in the gospel of Mark, concerning the blind man restored to sight—“I see men *as trees*—walking.” He saw them in rude and obscure outline, not in their proper and definite shape, for his faculty of seeing was not yet *educated*. So must it have been with our first parents, in relation to several powers. What philosophy would demand, religious tradition has supplied. The first pair formed the germ and centre of true Society: hence three laws or principles are declared, needful to the object of creation—1. *The knowlege of food*, and the institution of marriage, because man is a mortal being; 2. *The law of labor*, because man is a progressive being, and shall thus develope both himself and outward nature; 3. *The revelation of God*, because man is a moral and religious being, with a Future before him conditioned upon his wise obedience to the *Divine laws* of his nature in the Present.

Creation  
implies  
revelation.



tradition wisely places the first man in *a garden*, where trees of an innocent character alone are planted,—superadding, that he was *there* instructed to discriminate, from other products, those which the Creator had adapted for food. The record is preserved, but in general terms, for our instruction; so that we may compare our modern devices with the primæval arrangements of the Edenic constitution. What was the law?

“And GOD said—Behold, I have given you every herb, shedding seed, on the face of all the earth,—and every tree in which is the fruit of a tree, yielding seed,—TO YOU IT SHALL BE FOR FOOD.” Gen. i. 29.

Now the process of manufacturing alcoholic drink, by brewing and fermenting—to say nothing of *sabbath-malting*,—not only manifests discontent with the finished dietetic arrangements of God, in providence as in Paradise,—but it involves a direct and needless violation of the divine law, and an awful waste and wholesale destruction of *human food*. That which God, the All-Father, gives in his mercy as food *for all*,—individual men—no matter under what legal or social sanction—wilfully destroy. Nay, it is worse than destruction—for it is not only the conversion of the solid into the fluid, but the transmutation of actual *bread* into a *drink* which poisons and pollutes alike the social and the physical life of man. That I have read the Divine appointment aright, is evident from the literal rendering of a Mosaic law delivered 3000 years later.

“When thou shalt besiege a city .. *thou shalt not spoil the trees thereof* by driving an axe against them; ... For is the tree of the field [God planted] a man that it should be besieged by thee? ... only trees which thou knowest [are] *not trees for food*, thou mayest corrupt and cut down.” Deut. xx.  
19, 20.

In this sense the law has been understood thro'out the East. In the instructions given by the conquering Caliphs to their officers in command of the army in Syria, we find this injunction:—“Destroy not the palms—burn not the wheat—cut not down the fruit trees.”<sup>p</sup> I will only observe, that simply to burn the grain now converted into drink, would be a comparative blessing to the community: the drink could not then burn out the virtue and health of our population. Men foolishly enquire, Why God gives us the barley and the grape? For ‘*meat*,’ says God—not drink—and therefore it is solid. What a strange insanity to suppose the Creator to grow a *solid*, which the Creature must convert into *fluid* before it is useable! The conceptions of Moses were very different. A.D. 700.

“When ye shall come into the land, and shall have planted all [sorts] of trees *for food*, ... in the fifth year shall ye eat the *fruit* thereof.” Lev. xix. 23-5.

And Isaiah, discoursing of the new heavens and the new earth, wherein righteousness shall dwell, assures us that the old law of Paradise lost, shall be the law of Paradise regained; and that the ancient connexion between long-life and temperance shall be established once more:—

“They shall plant vineyards, and *eat* the *fruit* of them; Isaiah

“They shall not plant and another *eat*;

“For as the days of a tree shall be the days of my people ... lxv. 21-3.

“For they are a race blessed by Jehovah,

“And their offspring shall remain to them.”

A law of *drink* would have been an absurdity, since law implies choice, and choice variety. But in Eden, as in Nature, there is not variety,



but an absolute *oneness*, of drink—the water of the stream, the water of milk, the water of the juicy fruit,—but still *water*. The river which parted into ‘four ways’—did not become four different liquids. Hence, as Adam was in no danger of choosing wrong when thirsty, he needed no verbal law to put him right. Water was the appointed beverage of Paradise, for man in his best estate, and by the same great Being was given to his wandering children during their hard sojourn of forty years in the wilderness.

III.—TEETOTALISM, AS PRACTISED BY INDIVIDUALS AND BY SOCIETIES, DIVINELY SANCTIONED IN THE BIBLE.

Sanction may be expressed in two modes: by *deed* and by *word*. Proverbially, ‘actions speak louder than words’—and they do so because they speak more unmistakeably. Now, none even dream that God supplied to Adam any other beverage than the *natural* element of water, welling-forth from fountains or oozing from fruit; much less that he *inspired* him to anticipate the discoveries of other ages, for the production of a new and more exciting fluid.

“Wherever fountain or fresh current flow’d  
Against the Eastern ray, translucent, pure,  
He drank;”—or from clear milky juice of fruits  
His thirst allayed.

In appointing our first parents,—the most physically unique of their kind,—*drinkers of aqueous fluid* exclusively, God sanctioned teetotalism in *deed*. I put the greater stress on this fact, because the Redeemer has employed a related one in precisely the same manner. When the Pharisaic advocates of ancient usage and low permissions urged against him, that polygamy and divorce were right *because* Moses of old had *commanded* them—the Great Teacher answered—“Moses of old, *because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered* you to put away your wives;—*but*”—passing from the formal to the natural, from that which had been suffered to that which His Father had unequivocally sanctioned *by act* in Paradise, when the first marriage was consecrated, Christ adds—“*from the beginning it was not so.*” So, I affirm, accepting this argument as the pillar and precedent for my own, *in the beginning*, when God established the most perfect laws of diet in Eden, *teetotalism as certainly prevailed* as when He became the purveyor of his people Israel for forty years in the desert.

Another and remarkable case is that of the wife of Manoah and her son Samson, ‘the living Dread’ of the Philistian tyrants, and the Avenger of Israel. As one who had to ‘*begin*’ the deliverance of his nation in a rude age of force, *physical strength* was a fitting quality.

“Samson,” says Archdeacon Hale, “was the son of Manoah, whose wife was assured *by a celestial visitant*, that it was the Divine intention to bestow a child upon them. *He gave directions respecting her own mode of living*, \*—which was to be abstemious,—and the consecration

\* God wisely adapts his means to his ends, observing the *natural* law on which strength depends before imparting that which is *supernatural*. The prescription to the Mother proves this: for if it were *mere* Miracle, that would have been most distinctly shown by giving strength to a feeble child. That the *supernatural* strength of Samson depended on his being unshorn, is true; but it is equally true that his preceding *natural* strength was conditioned on a natural law of diet, applicable to *both* mother and child,—for the ‘symbolic’ condition only concerned *one*.

Ἀριστον  
μεν  
υδωρ

Individual  
and Societary  
teetotalism  
sanctioned.

Appointed  
in Paradise  
in the wilder-  
ness, and in  
Israel,  
to the fairest,  
the strongest  
and the best:

To Adam and  
Eve; to Sam-  
son and his  
mother; to  
Samuel and to  
John.



of her future son as a *Nazarite* from the womb,—a term applied to those who were separated, either voluntarily or by their parents, to a life of mortification and hardship, *with a view to accomplish some important design.*"<sup>a</sup> B.C. 1155.

Now, to Samson's mother the 'Angel of Jchovah' *twice* appeared, commanding her to abstain from strong-drink.\* Teetotalism, therefore, as an *express prescription*, is recorded as having first been brought from Heaven to Earth by an Angel of the Lord. †

Judges  
xiii. 3, 4.

Cotemporary with Samson is the Judge of Israel, Samuel. The pious Hannah had prayed for a son, pledging herself to dedicate him as a *Nazarite* to the Lord, all the days of his life, if her desire might be fulfilled. God approved her prayer, gave to her a son, and at the age of twelve specially called him to the prophetic office. He founded schools for the education of the future prophets, and was an earnest and successful reformer in Israel: a worthy compeer of those great teetotalers, who, in other regions, were striving also to preserve purity and justice on the earth.

B.C. 1137

Another notable instance is that of John the Baptist, the last prophet under the Mosaic dispensation, and more than a prophet. "Among those born of woman, there had not risen a greater." Heralding his birth to Zachariah, "Gabriel, who stands in the presence of God," appeared on earth, with this emphatic annunciation:—"He shall be great in the sight of the Lord; *and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink; and shall be filled with the Holy spirit* even from the mother's womb." Here teetotalism is placed as the antecedent to purity, as in the case of Samson to power.

Matt. xi. 11.

Luke i. 15.

The individual examples of Teetotalism, therefore, comprize the most remarkable personages of the pre-christian periods—Adam, the perfect man and first patriarch,—Eve, the fairest woman, and 'mother of all living,'—Samson, the strongest of mankind,—Samuel, the Prophet, Judge, and Priest,—and John, the last and greatest of the Hebrew seers—with whose powerful preaching the early dispensations close, and the new age is ushered in.

God has equally approved of *Societies* or *Associations* of Men, amongst whom the main bond of union was either a *voluntary pledge* or a *vow* of abstinence. ‡

Teetotal  
associations.

The law of the Nazarite is introduced with the solemn statement—"And *the Lord* spake unto Moses." From the *Origines Hebrææ*,

B. C. 1450.

Numb. vi.

\* Plato, seven centuries later, refers to a not dissimilar prohibition. Wine must not be drunk on nuptial occasions, if perfection of offspring be desired. (De Legib. towards the end.)

† In the face of this striking representation, some have dared to denounce teetotalism as *that* "doctrine of Dæmons" which consists in "abstaining from *meats* that God created"—the fact being, all the while, that teetotalers abstain only from a bad artificial *drink*—a drink made by the absolute *destruction* of that fruit which God created and appointed *for meat*.

‡ "The Nazarites and Rechabites," argues an objector, "were *more* than teetotalers; *ergo* they were *not* teetotalers"! Such reasoning deserves no reply. It is sufficient that, as regards the benefit of abstinence and the danger of wine, they were *one* with the modern teetotaler. The Prophets in referring to them, show that *they* understood *abstinence from wine* to be their chief characteristic. It is written—"Ye gave the Nazarites *wine* to drink"—not, Ye asked them to cut off their hair! So Jehovah (after testing their fidelity on *this* point) thus speaks of the Rechabites—"They have *drunk no wine* to this day."



published 130 years ago, an impartial and brief account of both the Nazarites and Rechabites may be cited:—

Nazarites. “One part of the special sanctity of a NAZARITE consisted in a total abstinence from wine, or anything intoxicating, *that he might the better attend to the study of the law, and other exercises of religion*; which justifies in part what Maimonides [no favorer of their vow] says, that *Nazarites were advanced to the dignity of Priests*, who were not allowed to drink wine ... in the time of their ministration.\*

Rechabites. “The RECHABITES were a sort of votaries among the Hebrews, descended from Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses, and his son Hobab, from whom came Rechab, who was called *The Just*. It is uncertain *when* they first formed themselves into a *Society*; but they always had orders and regulations peculiar to themselves. *They were remarkable for their strict piety and integrity of life*, and were originally called Kenites. They likewise had the name of Scribes, because they studied the law, and were very ready in the expounding of it. † Jonadab seems to have refined their old discipline; and they always appealed to his injunctions as the founder of *the fraternity* ... They were bound to *drink no wine*, nor to build houses, but to dwell in tents [a sanitary and politic law, not at all unpleasant in the soft climate of Palestine]; nor to sow seed, nor to plant vineyards, nor to have any; *but to give themselves up to a contemplative life, and avoid all occasions of luxury and avarice*. This Religious Society was highly approved of by God.” †

Dr. Chalmers, in his Scripture Notes, rightly regards the Rechabites as a *Temperance Society*—united, I add, by a family pledge, to which they adhered with intelligent fidelity, and for doing which they were set forth as an ensample by God.

#### IV.—THE DIVINE TEACHING IN THE BIBLE IMPLIES THAT TEETOTALISM IS A PHYSIOLOGICAL LAW OR TRUTH.

Teetotalism sanctioned physiologically. This is virtually established by cases and circumstances already advanced; but I will adduce others, and regard some of the old facts from a somewhat different point of view.

The Nazarites were specially set apart, to do ‘honor to the Eternal’; and amongst them were reared some of the brightest ornaments of the Jewish Church. Daniel and his brethren had probably been trained in that school of self-denial, and thus had a double-reason for declining to drink the wine of Babylon or eat the luxurious meat of the King’s table. Be that as it may, God’s prophets were *so associated* with God’s Nazarites, that he regarded the offering of wine to the one as an offence parallel with the saying to the other, ‘Prophesy not.’ Now Jeremiah, in his Lamentations, contrasts the sinful children of Israel, ‘black’ and ‘withered’ in their captivity, with a people of a high moral and religious character.

Lam. iv. 7. “Her *Nazarites* were purer than snow;  
“They were whiter than milk:  
“*In body more ruddy than rubies,*  
“*Their countenance was as sapphire.*”

\* The garment worn by a Nazarite (as by the Baptist) was made of hair, and called *addareth*. Such was the mantle of Elijah; whence Grotius concludes, either that he was a Nazarite, or that the habit of a Prophet and a Nazarite was the same.

† In this respect they resembled bishop Timothy. If the Bible is opposed to Teetotalism, it is singular these expounders of it should never once discover the fact during a study of the law, and an intercourse with living prophets, extending over a thousand years!



Here, then, we have distinct evidence concerning the members of an institution which had been tried for six centuries, that the practice of abstinence was associated, not only with great moral purity, but with the highest physical health and beauty.\*

The result of the trial of 'abstinence *versus* drinking' at the court of Babylon, confirms the position. Daniel must have known quite well, that Pythagorean diet would agree with those (for there's the rub) who could agree with *it*. It *had* agreed with our common Father and his children for many ages—with Israel wandering in the wilderness and conquering in Canaan—with the gallant tribes of Rechab,—with the Nazar-clad Elijah in the three years of famine,—and also with the Divinely constituted Nazarites. Daniel never dreamt it would require a 'miracle'—day by day—to make nourishing Pulse and pure Water *suit* the wants of that body for which Infinite Wisdom had expressly adapted them! A doubt about the matter was reserved for the wisacres of the nineteenth century—who first make a wonder of the result, and then sublimate the 'wonder' into a 'miracle.' The King of Babylon desired to have four noble youths chosen from the Hebrew captives, to appear in his presence, and be educated for the service of his government. A daily provision of meat and wine from the royal table was set apart for their use, Daniel and three companions being selected. They were to be 'nourished' with meat and wine three years,—but declined both, deeming their use a defilement.

B. C. 600.

Case of Daniel.

"And the prince of the Eunuehs said to Daniel—I fear my lord, the King, for he *might see your faces in worse condition than the youths of your age*; then shall ye endanger my head."

Dan. i. 3-17.

Daniel,—who might well smile at such fears, the offspring of drinking-ignorance,—at once returned a good teetotal answer to the steward set over them:—

"TRY *thy servants ten days*, and let them give us *pulse* || to eat, and *water* to drink. Then let *our countenances* be looked upon before thee, and the countenances of the youths that do eat of the King's food, *and as thou seest*, deal with thy servants ... And at the end of ten days, *their countenances appeared fairer and fatter in flesh* than all the youths who eat the portion of the King's food." So the steward took away the meat and the wine, and

|| רעסו  
Zehrohem,  
lit. seeding  
vegetables.

\* On Numb. vi. 3, the learned Mr. GREENFIELD, has this sensible note:—

"The Nazarites *for life* were not bound to the same strictness as the others. His hair was the *proof* and *emblem* of his separation to God ... Besides the religious nature of this institution, it seems to have been partly of a *civil and prudential use*. The sobriety and temperance which the Nazarites were obliged to observe *were very conducive to health*. Accordingly they were celebrated for their *fair and ruddy complexion*; being said to be both whiter than milk and more ruddy than rubies—the sure signs of a sound and healthy constitution. It may here be observed, that when God intended to raise up Samson, by his strength of body to scourge the enemies of Israel, he ordered that, from his infancy he should drink no wine—*because that would greatly contribute to make him strong and healthy*; intending, *after Nature had done her utmost to form this extraordinary instrument* of his Providence, to supply her defect by his own supernatural power."—*Bagster's Comprehensive Bible*, Lond. 1829. (See also Jennings's Jewish Antiquities, B. i. c. 8).



gave them pulse \* ... And in all matters of *wisdom and understanding* ... the King ... found them *ten times better than all the scribes and magicians* that were in all his realm."

These water-drinkers showed also, at a subsequent period, that their diet was compatible with the coolest bravery and heroism. It did not fatten their flesh to enfeeble their brain. The fiery-furnace had no terrors for them: God was *able* to deliver them, and they believed He would; "*but if not*, be it known unto thee, O King! that we will *not* worship the golden image which thou hast set up." I am persuaded myself, that if men, now-a-days, were simpler in their habits, they would be stouter in their hearts. Neither gold, nor tinsel, would have so many servile worshipers.

Tetotalism  
and strength.

In another history the scriptures recognize tectotalism as an organic law necessary to the fullest development of physical *strength*. I refer once more to Samson—

Jehovah's "nursling and choice delight,  
His destined from the womb;  
Promised by heavenly message, twice descending;—  
*Under whose special eye*  
*Abstemious* he grew up and thrived amain"—  
Matchless in might—the miraele of men.

Samson.

Samson the predestined hero of his tribe, must be constituted *strong*. The antecedent natural *conditions* must consequently be observed: for He who made the organic laws can not be supposed to dishonor by needlessly neglecting them—in short, can not contradict himself. Let us note what are the means for the accomplishment of the end, as expressed in the announcement to the mother of Samson:—

"And the Angel of the Lord appeared *unto the woman*, saying:—Now, *beware!* drink not wine nor strong-drink, and eat not any unclean thing; FOR the child shall be a Nazarite unto God from the womb, *and he shall begin to deliver Israel out of the hand of the Philistines.*"

The miracle  
objection.

How direct and pertinent is the comment of the good Bishop Hall! "The *mother* must conceive the only giant of Israel, and yet must drink but water; neither must the *child* touch any other cup. *Never wine made so strong a champion as water did here!*" The cry of 'miracle' is again raised, only to be confuted by the various particulars of the text. Is it a 'miracle' for an Angel—i. e. a *messenger*—to carry a *message*? If the whole of Samson's singular endowment was *arbitrary*—why the double message?—why the '*beware!*' and the explanation as to the *wherefore*?—why any message at all to the *mother*?—why must *her* diet be so carefully selected in order that God might do a 'miracle' on her son thirty years afterwards? If God does no *needless* miracle, † it must be very absurd to suppose that an angel

\* Will the objector say that the miracle of goodlooking Pythagoreans was *continued* for years? or that Daniel departed from his dietary because he grew thin and weak, and went back to the flesh-pots and wine? If the objector *intrudes* miracles where they are neither recorded nor required; he might as well put in any *lesser* matter!

† *On the natural turning of water into WINE-IN-THE GRAPE, and at the miraculous transmutation of water into SIMILAR wine, at Cana.*

Bishop Hall.

"He, that could have created wine immediately in those vessels, will rather turn water into wine. In all the course of his miracles I do never find him making ought of nothing: all his great works are grounded upon former

is commissioned to convey a number of useless prescriptions to the earth,—prescriptions which have no earthly relationship to their *apparent* purpose, or to the immediate occasion which *seems* to have called them forth!

To the flatulent folly that would evacuate all sense and meaning from this narrative, I answer—A miracle there was, but that began only where the means *ended*. There was no miracle in that part of the transaction which concerns my theme. But there was something else: namely, a remarkable *anticipation* of the results of the science of our own day. Not until the natural is exhausted, or at least unavailable, can room be found for the supernatural. In the rude place and remote period of Samson's nativity, we cannot conceive that his parents were acquainted with the *physiological nexus* between diet and blood, between the blood of the mother and the vital tissues and organs of the child,—and so on. Yet, such a connexion existing, He who formed would certainly observe it in maturing the Champion on whom the Divine Spirit had to descend. A natural *process of preparation* would no more be forgotten in this, than in any other case. Now, for the spirit to select bodily *weakness* as the permanent organ for extraordinary *power*, would be an *unfitness* of the same sort as to have chosen a person of weak intellect for the office of St. Paul. It was, apparently, to avoid this very *risk* of incongruity,—and thus shut out all needless miracle—that the Angel appeared to the woman, imparting dietetic directions the necessity for which *she* would not otherwise have known,—but which it was needful *should* be strictly observed.

The law has been well stated by the late Dr. A. Combe, in his treatise *On the Physical Management of Infancy*.

Dr. Combe.

“CONDITIONS IN THE MOTHER AFFECTING THE HEALTH OF THE FUTURE CHILD.

“There is no period of life at which it is of so much consequence to observe *moderation and simplicity of diet*, and to avoid the use of *heating-food and stimulants* as during pregnancy.” (ch. iv.)

“It is a false and injurious delicacy which would try to divert attention from a truth so influential on happiness, *and which has long forced itself upon the notice of Physiologists and Physicians*. (ch. iii.)

Yet this was declared in Dan 3000 years ago! The Bible, in this matter, was wiser than men knew, and so was our noble Milton when he rebuked the sottishness of his day.

“O Madness! to think use of strongest wines,  
And strongest drinks, our chief support of health,  
When God, with these forbidden, *made choice to rear*  
*His mighty champion, strong above compare,*  
*Whose drink was only from the limpid brook.”*

Milton.

Sams. Agon.

From the best average health results the longest life, and from this the permanency of families and nations. When family titles, or whole tribes, become extinct, some organic law has surely been broken.

~~~~~  
existences. He multiplied the bread, he changed the water, he restored the withered limbs, he raised the dead; and still wrought upon that which *was*, and did not make that which was *not*. What doth he in the ordinary way of nature, but *turn the watery juice that arises up from the root into wine*? He will only do this now *suddenly and at once*, which he doth usually by *sensible degrees*. IT IS EVER DULY OBSERVED BY THE SON OF GOD, NOT TO DO MORE MIRACLE THAN HE NEEDS.”—*Bishop Hall's Contemplations*.<sup>2</sup>

Christ's wine



As Confucius has said, "Heaven shortens not the life of man; it is man himself who does it by his own vices." Ancient, as well as modern times, have presented ample proof of this,—proofs known to the Prophets as to the sons of Jonadab. The Bible, indeed, contains one of the most noteworthy illustrations of the connexion between *temperance and prolonged national existence*, which is to be found in all history. I allude to the Rechabites,—an Arabian and nomadic tribe, earnest seekers after truth, and proselytes to the Jewish religion, having renounced the stupid idolatry of their country for the worship of the invisible and true God. They were a peaceable and quiet people; not without bravery, as evinced in their expulsion of a degrading and cruel idolatry from the land; and possessed of great firmness of purpose and moral persistency, as evidenced by their respectful but unhesitating refusal to drink wine even when offered by a prophet. In brief, they were a very favorable specimen of Arabian character, and, as distinguished horsemen, may be regarded as the Chivalry of the Wilderness. || About three hundred years before the time of Jeremiah, Jonadab had renewed and amended the laws of the tribe. Anxious for the preservation of the people,—and knowing that they only remained in Canaan by *permission*, as friends and allies of Israel,—he adopted every precaution to keep them peaceful and obedient, and to exclude the growth of avarice and luxury. He commanded them to continue that nomadic and simple mode of life which they had practised for ages,—to dwell as heretofore in tents, lest the acquiring of fixed property should generate an attachment that might bring them into conflict with the permanent proprietors of the soil or excite cupidity in others,—to abstain from that drink which is 'raging,' lest it should breed quarrels, and from vintage fruit lest it should foster luxury, or, in some of its forms, thro' ignorance and mistake, lead to the use of the fermented kinds of wine. They did this, that they might '*live long in the land*,'—on which passage Noyes says—

"These words seem to indicate *the main purpose of the regulations of Jonadab*, the son [i. e. descendant] of Rechab ... Their observance, would, he supposed, keep them on good terms with the Jews, as they would have fewer possessions to excite envy, ... *and would possess more self-command, and more caution in avoiding quarrels.*"<sup>s</sup>

The interview between Jeremiah and the Rechabites temporarily dwelling at Jerusalem, is very instructive. He takes them into the house of Jehovah, and sets before them, to *test* their fidelity, pots full of wine. He does not *tempt* them. Neither the plea of argument, nor the pressure of Divine 'authority,' is applied. He regards their refusal to drink as a virtue. Jeremiah, it appears, dare no more have given wine *to them* than to the Nazarites, on his own responsibility. The kind of wine we may assume to have been *proper*, such as was provided for the temple-service: a wine that might be innocently drunk by men in general, tho' not by the Rechabites. The Prophet received an express *command* before venturing even to *offer* wine to these abstainers;—but he is *not* authorized to say anything in favor of the wine, or against the practice of the sons of Jethro. There is no intimation that *God* desires them to drink. It is merely the man *Jeremiah* that speaks:—

"I said to them—Drink ye wine! But they said, *We will not drink wine.*"

The answer was deemed sufficient by the prophet, accompanied as it was by a reference to the noble purpose and venerable origin of

Rechabites.

Judg. i. 10.

Exod. xviii. 9.

1 Chron. ii. 55

2 Kings x. 15.

1 Sam. xv. 6.

Judg. iv. 16, 17

|| Rechab  
signifies  
'a rider.'

Prof. Noyes.

Jer. xxxv.



their abstinence, the merits of which had then been tested by an experience of centuries. He does not urge them to violate or abandon their principles—which, *if they were wrong*, he might well have done—but clearly showed, in refraining from all solicitation, the deference which he felt to their conscientious scruples. Nay, it is no longer Jeremiah who speaks,—all that follows has a higher authority:—

“*Then came the Word of Jehovah to Jeremiah, saying:—The words of Jonadab, the son of Rechab, in which he commanded his sons not to drink wine, have been performed; for they have drunk no wine to this day,*” etc.

To understand the ‘blessing’ pronounced on the Rechabites we must look at their own reasons for abstinence:—

“Jonadab, the Son of Rechab, our Father, commanded us saying, *Ye shall drink no wine, \* ye nor your sons, for ever, ... THAT YE MAY LIVE LONG IN THE LAND WHEREIN YE ARE STRANGERS.*”

They would dwell for ever, even *as strangers*, in the land, if they might but know God who revealed himself there. Hence, that they might be neither expelled nor destroyed as a people, *thro intemperance*—that they might avoid the sin and pride of Ephraim,—that they might live long *in the land where Israel dwelt*,—they would drink no wine. They had a right to expect, both on grounds of reason and experience, the continued existence of their tribe. The *word* confirms this; it promises that the very object of their hopes *shall* be realized, in substance, if not in form. God himself is pledged to fulfil their expectations, *enlarging* indeed the very blessing which they sought.

“*THUS SAITH JEHOVAH OF HOSTS ... There shall not fail in the line of Jonadab, the Son of Rechab, MEN TO STAND BEFORE ME FOR EVER.*” The blessing

He who made the preserving law of temperance, and *foresaw* the consequences of its rigid observance to the end of time,—also foresaw, what the sons of Rechab did not, that Israel should himself be expelled from the land of his fathers, which could then be no habitation for his allies. Hence, the promise is *not* limited, as were their expectations, *to the land* of Israel, but extended in its substance to THE ENTIRE DURATION OF HUMANITY. There, or elsewhere, if faithful to the preserving law, *the posterity of the Rechabites should maintain their existence as a people.*

Now comes the question, Have these people been faithful to their pledge, and God to his promise? The answer must be in the affirmative. Rabbi Benjamin, of Tudela, in the twelfth century, mentions their existence; and Dr. Joseph Wolff, in his first Journal of Travel, records having met with some of them twenty-five years ago. He found them to resemble their ancestors; willing to receive truth, and the Jews, to read and circulate the New Testament; simple in their manners, kind, courteous, brave, intelligent, and as horsemen, the most accomplished cavaliers of the orient. One of them whom he saw, and who referred to Rechab as his ancestor, read fluently both in Arabic and Hebrew, and invited Dr. Wolff to visit his tribe in the vicinity of Mecca, calculating their number at about 60,000. The Missionary was struck with the fine appearance of the man, and notices that he had a loud voice, and was distinguished by “*a more lively countenance than the Arabs.*” These tribes dwell in tents, which

Dr. Wolff

\* The tent-law they occasionally departed from, for they were then in Jerusalem; but the reason of *this* law was universal.



they have pitched in three oases of the desert, and they neither sow seed nor plant vineyards.

Thus amidst the clash of conquest and the crush of kingdoms,—while the mighty Empires of Persia and of Greece, of Rome and of Parthia, have risen in glory, and declined in shame,—and while the desolating armies of the Saracen and the Crusader, of the Mongol and the Turk, have rolled over the battle field of the east,—amidst the long and sad eclipse of Israel, and the triumph of the Crescent over the banner of the Cross,—in short, amid the ruin and revolution of twenty four centuries,—the noble and united Band of Rechabites have preserved their simplicity and their freedom,—remaining, amidst the wrecks of time, an impressive monument of Prophetic truth, and a living witness to the imperishable nature of the Divine laws.

Teetotalism  
a Divine  
remedy

V.—THE BIBLE REPRESENTS TEETOTALISM AS A DIVINE REMEDY FOR INTEMPERANCE.

I have already said, that with ordinary cases of individual conduct and social government, the Scripture does not represent God as interfering. Truth, on common matters, was rather developed than revealed, and appears rather in the form of general law than special detail. Various evil-things were not only *tolerated* in ‘the days of ignorance,’ but *expressly permitted*. Men, in general, amongst the Jews, were allowed to pursue their natural bent. Revealed truth was never designed to *supersede* natural Light. If we neglect to develop our powers,—if we despise the dictates of experience, or the demonstrations of science,—since these affect not only the physical, but the social and moral health of nations, we must reap the bitter penalty of our folly;—God will *not* interfere to set us right; much less to abolish the Economy of his own creation. Apart from the special purpose and beyond the defined limits of Inspiration, we ought not to expect, and in fact do not find, any supernatural, explicit, and exhaustive unfoldings of our duty. It is no part of the Divine plan to direct the specialities of human life by the proclamation of what an opponent challenges—“an imperial mandate of absolute interdiction.” || It is enough that, when fitting occasions transpire, clear *intimations* of the Truth are put forth. Now such an occasion is represented to have arisen when the sons of Aaron the High Priest offered “profane fire before the Eternal, which he commanded them not.” Agreeably to my argument, a special *interference* followed; and this circumstance occasions the publication of a distinct and adapted law. Intemperance having interfered with the revealed Economy, and with the proper observance of the Divine ordinances, *God must interfere with it*. Still, the ‘form’ of the interference is limited to the special object and occasion—the ‘spirit’ is of course another affair. God will protect the purity of his own institutions. Leaving *man*, as man, to pursue undisturbed the path of natural duty, God speaks to *the Priest*, as priest.

|| See the  
Masham  
Discussion,  
1836, and  
note to  
Propos. vi.

“I *will* be sanctified in them that approach unto me;  
“And before all the people I *will* be glorified.”

The glory of the sanctuary of the Most High must not again be tarnished by the intemperance of the officiating Priests. “Other priests,” as an opponent admits, “*might* be rendered unfit for their office by inebriety”—even as those that had perished. Now, what *was* the plan devised and adopted by Eternal Wisdom to avert this risk? Was it moral suasion? No: that would have been proper in correcting the



wrong-doing of man's own work, but not *here*. Was it the vague modern prescription to 'use, but not abuse, the good creature'? No: that was known already, and had failed. Was it mere advice like that announced to rulers—"It is not for kings to drink wine." No! It was a clear return to the old Egyptian plan of Abstinence, *with a penalty attached to its violation*. As a remedy for intemperance, the Bible absolutely represents teetotalism as issuing from the Councils of the Everlasting.

"And the Eternal spake unto Aaron, saying—DO NOT DRINK \* WINE NOR STRONG-DRINK, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the appointed tent, *lest ye die*: it is an ordinance for ever thro'out your generations; that ye may distinguish between the holy and the unholy, and between the unclean and the clean; *and that ye may teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the Eternal hath spoken.*" <sup>u</sup>

Lev. x.

Here, so far as the Priestly Office is concerned, we *have* 'a mandate of absolute interdiction.' The *moral object* was to secure the function of the Teacher being performed aright by preserving his normal condition,—hence the Jews, in after ages, extended the principle of the law, *by analogy*, to Kings and Rulers;—the *direct object* to be accomplished, was the total prevention of intemperance,—the *philosophical means* adopted was teetotalism, put forth as law, and thus contra-distinguished from mere advice.

If a Plymouth-brother, or an Unbeliever, chose to dispute the *wisdom*, or the *necessity*, of Teetotalism as the PROPHYLACTIC FOR INTEMPERANCE—I simply refer them to the book. Their quarrel is with GOD, or with *it*—not with me as the Interpreter. I, at least, am sure that God would neither go *beyond*, nor stop *short* of, the very *needs* of the case; and I am equally sure of the historic fact, that nothing less ultra than teetotalism ever *has* cured the Intemperance either of Priests or People.

Teetotalism a preventative enjoined by God

#### VI.—THE BIBLE REPRESENTS ABSTINENCE AS A DIVINELY APPOINTED PHYSICAL PREPARATION FOR THE HIGHEST SPIRITUAL LIFE.

The proofs of the preceding propositions are most of them proofs of this, and need not be formally repeated. A sound, uncorrupted body is the best organ for a moral life, while indulgence in luxury and stimulants is obviously incompatible with it. Intoxicating drink, as the Wise Man declares, excites the lower and sensual nature. Bayle has justly remarked, that "a man *elevated with wine* finds himself more inclined and disposed to transgress the laws of chastity ... Generally speaking, there is nothing material to say against what the Italians object, that *wine and good cheer excite to impurity*. It is the constant doctrine of the ancient Pagans and [christian] Fathers, *confirmed by the experience of all ages and places.*" <sup>t</sup> The Bible history, as we have seen, illustrates the doctrine with terrible distinctness. Not to recite the opinions of Moses, Isaiah, and the authors of the Proverbs, I will here confine myself to the doctrine as expressed or implied in the Divine Institutes.

Abstinence a divinely appointed preparation for religious life

Bayle

First, *God prohibited wine to the Priests, all the while they ministered in holy things, in the tabernacle or the temple.* \*

\* "True," says an objector, "but *only* then; how do you apply it to *all men, at all times?*"

We do *not* apply it as a positive prohibition to all men,—but regard it as a special law involving an *universally applicable principle*, Dr. Thomas Arnold,

Dr Arnold.



About the purpose of this prohibition, commentators have been agreed: why, then, should they dispute its *necessity* or its *wisdom*?—or what is the same thing, affirm the excellence and safety of the prohibited article?

Josephus

“As for the Priests,” remarks Josephus, he prescribed to them a *double degree of purity*.—They abstained from wine, *lest otherwise they should transgress* some rules of their ministration.”<sup>i</sup>

Now it is clear, that, unless wine had in itself a *disturbing* power, it would no more need to be prohibited to Judges and Priests—“*lest they should err in vision and stumble in judgment*”—than would milk.

On Lev. x. 10, Dr. Adam Clarke, observes:—

“This is a *strong reason* why they should drink no inebriating liquor, *that their understandings being clear and their judgments correct*, they might be always able to discern between the clean and the unclean, and ever pronounce righteous judgment. *Injunctions similar to this*, were found among the Egyptians, Carthaginians, and Greeks.”

Dr A Clarke

These injunctions wherever found, imply that *the highest functions of life* are incompatible with the use of *intoxicating* liquor. The Jews evidently understood this; for they applied abstinence to the *Ruler*, “*lest he should pervert judgment*,”—and the early Christians, as appears from the ‘*Apostolic Constitutions*,’ applied it to the *Ministers*. If good in the administering of law, it must be good for the administration of a holy life. The Divine prohibition translated into the plainest fact, is just equivalent to saying:—

“With your *ordinary* work and life, I shall not interfere. You may imitate my doings, or follow your own devices,—my positive law will not be carried into the natural sphere,—but *this* work of the Holy Tent and the Temple is *my* work; and *it shall be done only on the principle of abstinence*.”

Abstinence  
divinely  
prescribe to  
the Nazarites

Second, *God prescribed abstinence from wine to his Holy Nazarites, specially raised up to exhibit a life of purity*.

On Numbers vi., Dr. Haweis says:—

“There will be found among God’s people, some more eminent for their graces than others—the Nazarites among their brethren, [who were] *not to taste wine*, that they might show themselves *patterns of sobriety*, and be ever fit for the service of God.—They who have a deep concern about their soul, will have a *noble neglect* of the body.”

Art. Nazarite

The symbolic teaching involved in this institute, as it would appear to a Jew, is well expressed in Dr. Kitto’s *Cyclopædia*:—

“As the Nazarite was separated to the Lord, so was it proper that he *should be in full vigor of body* (secured by the presence of his hair) *and of mind* (secured by abstinence from strong drink). As animals offered in sacrifice were to be faultless and spotless, *so a man or a woman set apart to God was to be in full possession of their faculties*.”<sup>y</sup>

Vicar Jordan

in his admirable essay *On the right Interpretation of the Scriptures*, says:—“*Commandments* may be of a transitory nature, and binding [as such] only upon particular persons, or at particular times; *but yet when they proceed from the highest authority, their indirect use may be universal*.”—So the Vicar Jordan observes of Gen. ii. 3, that it is not a ‘*commandment*,’ but must be regarded “*as revealing a principle* to us rather than formally expressing a law,”—adding, “*we are bound to recognize and reverence the revelation of such a principle in the light of a law, and to obey it accordingly*.”—All which means, as I take it, that we owe allegiance to Truth or Divine Law wheresoever and howsoever we may discover it.



In other words, God taught that men and women were *not* in full possession of their faculties who drank that *wine* wherein is dissoluteness, and which, in fact, takes possession of *them*.

VII.—LASTLY, THE BIBLE REPRESENTS GOD AS THE INSPIRER OF THAT TEETOTAL DOCTRINE AND MOVEMENT WHICH PURIFIED JUDEA FROM INTEMPERANCE, AND PREPARED FOR THE CHRISTIAN DISPENSATION.

Teetotalism  
inspired of  
God

And why should this proposition be deemed incredible? Were not the preparation and mission of John,—and of that line of life-devoted Nazarites of which he was constituted the glory and the crown,—veritable *types* of this Historic Providence?

Men do not sufficiently understand the *Bible*, because their own minds are not *pervaded* with what I may call historico-providential ideas. “The very reverence bestowed on it,” says a distinguished author of our church, “has tended to generate some false notions, by preventing writers from taking *those comprehensive views of the state of man generally at that period*, which are requisite to the full understanding of the books on which they are commenting.”<sup>v</sup> Men look at Bible-facts as isolated and almost purposeless—at least, they seldom strive to *discover* their historic meaning and connexion. They forget that God-in-History is just as wise as in nature or revelation—and *would* be enquired of.

Christ, it is said, appeared in the ‘*fulness of time*.’ But what does this mean? Few can answer; while some refer the fact to a ‘Divine decree’ or ‘appointed period’! But these words cannot be meant to *exclude* the CAUSES of the fact, and should imply them. He who wisely decrees or appoints an *end*, must decree likewise the *means*,—and at least ‘appoint’ one event upon foresight of the actual existence of others to which it is related. The ‘fulness of time,’ I take it, must also mean the ‘fitness of time’—*that state of the Jewish and Gentile world which rendered the advent of Christ most suitable*—when in some wise or other, the due *preparation* had been made. This preparation of the soil of the world for the seed of the gospel had been going on for ages—the Hebrews being free and responsible instruments in the work. Who, with the Bible in his hand, *dare say* that if the Jews had been less stubborn and corrupt,—we should not have had Christianity before? If MAN had been prepared,—if the Infant-world had been more docile towards the Schoolmasters appointed to bring it to Christ,—if the prophets had not been stoned, the Nazarites tempted to transgress, and the Socratic teachers poisoned,—would God have *withheld* the Son? Now the prophets show how *intemperance* retarded the Messiah’s advent, by hindering this *preparation*; and how drunkenness, with its kindred vices,—stupidity of intellect and sensualness of heart,—compelled to the great Captivity. THEN “men *rose up early in the morning to follow strong-drink*,”—making it, as many now do, the *business* of life—“and *continued until night*, till wine inflamed them.” No rank or order of men were free from the vice: from priest and people, and from peasant to prince, “*all tables were filled with vomit and filthiness, and there was no place clean*.” But let us leap the gulf of centuries—let us pass from the lamentation by the river of Babylon, to the celestial song on the plains of Bethlehem—and what is Judea NOW?

Intemperance  
postponed  
Christianity

See isa. v.

‘I looked that  
it should bring  
forth grapes,  
and it brought  
forth wild  
grapes’

Enough of selfishness, and pride, and oppression—still more, as now, of hypocrisy, are there—but we find little DRUNKENNESS. The



Tectotalism  
flourished  
in Judea  
in the Century  
preceding  
Christ

A.D. 52  
1 Thes. v.

Acts ii.  
5, 13, 15

Acts iii. 1

Son hath come—and come at least to a *sober land*, prepared by the Providence of the Father. “The fact is,” as stated by an opponent, “*Tectotalism existed before our Lord was manifest in the flesh.* IT FLOURISHED IN JUDEA.\* Our Lord seems never to have met a drunkard.” The reason is obvious. He retired at night to commune with God—praying on the mount or walking by the shore of the star-gemmed lake: but, as Paul said (speaking from his own stand-point, in the middle of the first century—“*They that be drunken, are drunken by night*; but let us, who are (sons) of the day, BE SOBER.”

The temperance of the Holy Land is clearly evinced by the narrative in the second chapter of Acts. It was to a great number of *sober Jews*—“devout men out of every nation under heaven”—(*Truth-Seekers*, and therefore *Receivers* in the love of it)—that the Apostles first appealed,—as upon the *prepared* and *sober* twelve the Spirit of Language and Power first descended. Some few persons of the Self-complacent class,—who had already *got* all wisdom, and were above anything either novel or natural, and who disliked equally the *new* doctrine and the unfashionable *earnestness* with which it was announced,—taunt the whole assemblage of Jews with being “*full of γλευκους,*” *new or unfermented wine.* This happened before the third Jewish hour (our nine o’clock), the ordinary time for morning prayer and sacrifice, before which hour good Jews neither ate nor drank at all—often indeed on such festival days as those of Pentecost, not till noon—so as to be more fit for the sacred services of the temple. Now what did Peter answer, on behalf of the ‘devout Jews.’ Passing over the *ironical* language—since no man of sense could either *gravely* affirm, or *seriously* deny, that men were drunk with *unintoxicating* wine—he fixes on the implied charge of drunkenness. “*These men are NOT DRUNKEN, † as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day.*” Hereupon, Poole, the learned annotator, observes:—“How little soever (to our shame) such an argument would be of proof now, *it was in their sober times very conclusive.*” It would not have been so in the days of Isaiah, however, when men “*rose up early in the morning to follow strong-drink.*” Hence, between the Captivity of the Jews, and the coming of Christ, a very notable Temperance Reformation had been achieved. But effects imply Agencies—and moral effects moral Agents. That the Captivity was *of God*, the Bible asserts: let history proclaim the *fruits*, which, if good, must be also ascribed to Him. Two fatal evils existed—Intemperance and Idolatry—both must be destroyed. Observe the steps of Providence,

\* He adds—“*A strange prejudice prevailed in the East against the use of wine.*”—A ‘strange’ remark to be made by a Cornish Vicar in a ‘Pastoral Letter’—wherein he calls drink ‘*the deceitful cup!*’ Did the angel Gabriel also labor under a ‘*strange prejudice*’ when he appeared to Zachariah?

† One writer, after first distorting my views of this passage, proceeds to argue against them on the ground that Peter *supposed that the mockers supposed that the Jews were drunk with the gleukous!!* Now, Peter supposed no such thing. He expressly avoids repeating the mockers words—‘*full of gleukous.*’ Agreeably to *my* interpretation, the words applying to the *alleged agent* are omitted by Peter *because* ironical. But the Greek word translated ‘suppose’ will fail my critic; for it may be better translated ‘*assume*’ (falsely—for a purpose,—in the very sense in which *I* should characterize the criticism itself as ‘*a catch*’—an assumed notion, a dishonest quibble—a pretence *caught up*). What was meant by the word *gleukous*, however, does not materially concern tectotalism; since its use is not *sanctioned* by God.

A Plymouth  
Brother’s  
perversion  
exposed



and the agents employed, in this process of Reform and preparation. Teetotalism and Teetotalers are everywhere honorably associated with the grand work. A leaven of evil there was, which spread its corruption, *especially thro' the Rulers*, in Church and State,—but still many noble spirits and lofty minds were growing up, longing for a more earnest and spiritual faith, for a higher culture, and a more perfect civilization.

During the Captivity of seventy years in Babylon, the habits, propensities, and even opinions of the Jews, underwent important changes. Affliction and foreign teaching, and the now felt excellence and superiority of the Nazaritish self-denial, led to reflection and reform. This could not fail to be confirmed by the illustrious example of Daniel and his brethren—and, in the latter period of the captivity, by the Persian teachers of temperance in the train of Cyrus. It was in the palaces of Babylon that the great Conqueror and the great Prophet, both teetotalers, probably conversed together,—on the rebuilding of Jerusalem. On the return of the Jews to Palestine, they exhibit no more their old inclination to idolatry—in fact, are no longer a *besotted people*. With the Grecian conquests the doctrines and discipline of the famous Pythagoras also spread, and, as Josephus intimates, his principles were adopted by the purest sect of the Jews. It is a period of mental conflict and transition, however. The old is dying out, the new has not yet been wrung in. Truth, rising from the mists of the Past, is battling in the gray dawn with the shadows of Night. Philosophy has already shattered the pillars of the Pagan superstition, and waits the inauguration of Christ in the Temple of Humanity. As the Missionary Malcom happily says, “*The people were trained to think, and both Jews and Pagans were capable of examining, and disposed to understand, the New Religion.*”<sup>w</sup> But amongst all the people of those ages none reached such heights of moral and social excellence as the Essenes. Their spirit, their maxims, and their practical life and principles, *so closely resembled those of Christ and his apostles*, that several learned Christians, including Vossius, have regarded them *as* christians; while *because* of this resemblance, some narrow modern writers have sought to depreciate them. But we need not rob these social Pioneers of Christ of *their* virtue, in order to clothe and enrich *Him*. He has a plenitude of glory and excellence without: for if they (living in Sodalties after the fashion of the Rechabites and Pythagoreans, and avoiding all occasions of luxury) taught and practised the principles of peace, the brotherhood and equality of men, the sinfulness of oaths and slavery,—*He* also taught these things, and in a wiser, humaner, and more perfect method—free from the superstitious and ascetic notions, which, almost universally, formed a part of the faiths of that period.\*

The learned author of the *Life of Saint Paul*, Mr. Conybeare, writing of the Essenes, says—“We need not doubt that *they* DID represent religious cravings which Christianity satisfied.” Philo, the Jew, observes that “they are dispersed thro' many parts of the

Historic  
preparation  
for the Gospel.

The Essenes  
Pioneers  
of Christ.

---

\* The history of Christ is *sui generis*. He was not, in *all* things, an example to us. Things requisite for ordinary men—as John—were not so for Him in whom the highest excellence was *connate*. As to the need of abstinence, we resemble John, not Christ: but *he* could distinguish infallibly between the ‘good creature’ and the bad ‘article.’



world, that Greeks and Barbarians should enjoy the benefit of their example, but they most abound in Egypt . . . They use no luxurious diet; their drink is *only water* from the stream: *temperance* being the foundation whereon they erect all other virtues." <sup>x</sup> Josephus says—  
 "They live to a great age, many of them to a hundred years and more. They reckon themselves to be upwards of 4000 souls in community."<sup>i</sup> They held a position among the ancient sects not dissimilar to that which is sustained by the genuine Teetotalers among the sects of our own day—the friends of purity and freedom, of education and progress. A writer in Dr. Kitto's *Cyclopædia* accurately expresses the aims and position of the Judean reformers:—

"Whilst the PHARISEES gave their countenance to *sustain the past*, with all its transmitted influences, *indiscriminately*, and the SADDUCEES adhered rigidly to the ancient Mosaic institution, to the rejection of what was traditional and adventitious, the ESSENES attempted to form a third way, which, without neglecting the past, should *bring new and powerful appliances to bear on the actual ills of society*; seeking not merely to reform and repair, but to heal and revive. Making small account of the *outward observances* of the Pharisee, and standing religiously aloof from the scepticism and narrow worldly spirit of his opponent the Sadducee, the ESSENES aimed at something practical—sought to originate an influence which should stem the advance of corruption, and *pour a sanitary and life-giving power into the veins of society*. For this purpose they founded a brotherhood, devised institutions. They were a *moral and religious order*. Neither riches nor poverty were known in their body. None had less, none more than enough."<sup>y</sup>

The spiritual *lineage* of this People radiates in characters of living light from their doctrines and their deeds. By *their works* we DO know them. But even their outward history is plain enough. They were the legitimate descendants of a race of reformers, upon whom, perhaps in Babylon, the mantle of Daniel fell,—or, in Palestine, of Jonadab, the nomadic chieftain, whose simple yet wise spirit they had imbibed, along with the doctrine of a social or Family Life for ends of highest virtue.

"From the *Nazarites*," says Dr. Adam Clarke, "sprang the *Rechabites*, from the Rechabites the *Essenes*"—who fulfilled their holy work, as did John, by *preparing in the wilderness for the footsteps of the Lord*. Whence, then, the Nazarites? and on what errand? Their mission may be clearly inferred from a Divine rebuke preserved in the prophecy of Amos,—written in an age when their example was greatly needed as a *practical protest* against intemperance and sin.

"Ye gave the Nazarites wine to drink;

"And commanded my Prophets, saying, Prophecy not."

Finally, He who Inspired the Prophets to teach Truth—also appointed the Nazarites to testify against Corruption—two functions which *we*, under a broader charter, may well combine.

"I raised up your sons for Prophets,

"AND OF YOUR YOUNG MEN FOR NAZARITES:

"IS IT NOT EVEN THUS?—Saieth the Lord."